





Raffaello d'Urbino

Engraved by J. Smith

PHILOSOPHY.
The School of Athens

BLACKIE & SONS GLASGOW, EDINBURGH & LONDON



THE
IMPERIAL DICTIONARY,
ENGLISH, TECHNOLOGICAL, AND SCIENTIFIC;
ADAPTED TO THE
PRESENT STATE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART;
ON THE BASIS OF WEBSTER'S ENGLISH DICTIONARY;
WITH THE
ADDITION OF MANY THOUSAND WORDS AND PHRASES FROM THE OTHER STANDARD DICTIONARIES AND
ENCYCLOPEDIAS, AND FROM NUMEROUS OTHER SOURCES.
COMPRISING ALL WORDS PURELY ENGLISH,
AND THE PRINCIPAL AND MOST GENERALLY USED TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC TERMS; TOGETHER WITH THEIR
ETYMOLOGIES AND THEIR PRONUNCIATION, ACCORDING TO THE BEST AUTHORITIES.

EDITED BY JOHN OGILVIE, LL.D.

ILLUSTRATED BY ABOVE TWO THOUSAND ENGRAVINGS ON WOOD.

VOL. I.

BLACKIE AND SON:
QUEEN STREET, GLASGOW; SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON.

MDCCCLIV.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FRONTISPIECE.

THE picture from which our Frontispiece has been engraved, was painted by Raffaello, when under thirty years of age, for Pope Julius II. about the year 1509. It is in fresco, and painted on the wall of one of a superb suite of apartments in the Vatican, called *La camera della Segnatura*. The size of the picture is 26 feet 6½ inches in length, by 15 feet 11 inches in height. Originally named "PHILOSOPHY," but now better known by the very inappropriate name, "THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS," this painting emblemizes the wisdom of the ancients in a representation of the learned men of ancient times. Raffaello has here assembled in a large atrium, in the noble style of Bramante, many teachers of philosophy with their scholars, though living at different periods and in different countries; some are seen imparting instruction to an admiring audience, others demonstrating problems to surrounding pupils, some thoughtful, others communicative; each individual following the bent of his own genius.

Plato, and Aristotle his disciple, occupy the middle of the scene, and are holding a disputation. Plato, the representative of Speculative Philosophy, points upwards with uplifted arm; Aristotle stretches his outspread hand toward the earth, as the source of his Practical Philosophy. At each side, stretching deeper into the picture, a double row of attentive hearers is seen. Near this group, upon the left, Socrates, counting on his fingers, explains his principles and their conclusions to the young warrior Alcibiades, who is recognized by the beauty of his countenance and by his costume. On the opposite side, are placed several persons engaged in different ways, in conversation and study. In the foreground, on both sides, the sciences of Arithmetic and Geometry, with their subordinate studies, occupy separate groups. On the left, as the head of Arithmetic, we observe Pythagoras seated and writing on his knee; a young man holds up to him a tablet, on which are drawn the harmonic chords discovered by that philosopher, and around are his disciples Empedocles, Epicharmus, and Archytas. On the right, Archimedes, bending down, constructs a geometrical figure on a tablet lying on the ground. Several scholars watch his progress; the different degrees of their intelligence being most strikingly depicted. To Archimedes, Raffaello has given the features of his patron and preceptor in architecture and geometry,

DESCRIPTION OF THE FRONTISPIECE.

Bramante, the celebrated architect. Next them are seen, as representing Astronomy and Geography, Zoroaster, the king of Bactria, his head adorned with a radial crown, and holding a celestial globe, and Ptolemy, the geographer, holding a terrestrial globe. Near to Zoroaster are two figures entering the hall, representing Raffaele and Perugino his master in painting. Alone, and seated on the steps, Diogenes, the chief of the cynic philosophers, in a state approaching to nudity, meditates on a tablet which he holds in his hand. A youth, directed by an old man, turns from him to the teachers of a higher philosophy.

“The general arrangement of this painting is most masterly. Plato and Aristotle, with the group of their scholars, are placed together in dignified regularity, without any appearance of stiffness or constraint; on each side and around them greater freedom prevails, with the utmost variety in the attitudes of the figures which compose the groups; while again the leading masses are still balanced most satisfactorily. The style is grand and free; a picturesque unity of effect seems to have been the artist’s aim throughout, and this aim he has attained most perfectly. The taste of design, both in the nude and in drapery, is excellent, and is everywhere guided by the purest sentiment of beauty; the group of youths, in particular, collected round Archimedes, is among the most interesting and natural of Raffaele’s creations.”—*Kugler*.

P R E F A C E.

For a number of years past a great revolution has manifestly been going on in the English language. Many words and terms formerly current have now passed into oblivion ; many others have acquired new meanings, while the old ones have become obsolete, and in a greater variety of instances, new significations have been added, while the old ones are still retained; and thousands of words and terms have been introduced into our language which were altogether unknown in the time of Johnson, or even at a considerably later period. In ordinary literary and non-scientific works also, many words and terms are introduced which were formerly only to be met with in works of a strictly scientific character, and which have not hitherto found their way into any of our common English dictionaries. The reader must therefore remain in utter ignorance of the meaning of many of these terms, unless he be possessed of a library of dictionaries of the various departments of human knowledge, and even with that advantage, he will be often at fault, as many such terms have not yet been introduced into any dictionary whatever.

Various circumstances have contributed to bring about this result, but more especially the rapid progress which has in modern times been made in numerous departments of inquiry, the discoveries in science and the arts, the extensive applications of science to the various branches of industry, the popularization of knowledge, and its diffusion among the masses of the people.

From what has been stated above it appears obvious that an English dictionary of a comprehensive character—embracing all authorized English words both old and new, with their etymologies and various significations, and also the principal terms employed in the arts and sciences; and serving as a book of easy and ready reference to all classes of English readers, must prove of the highest utility, and must tend powerfully to facilitate the progress and diffusion of general knowledge. To supply this *desideratum* is the great object of the IMPERIAL DICTIONARY.

The principal dictionaries of the English language in use at present, are Johnson's, first published in 1755 ; Richardson's, commenced in 1826 ; and that of Webster, of America, first published in this country in 1832.

Johnson's dictionary, although it must ever be regarded as a monument of the ability, labour, and research of its celebrated author, is nevertheless in some respects a very defective

b*

work. The etymological part is meagre and imperfect, being copied chiefly from Skinner and Junius; a great number of well authenticated English words are wanting, and although this defect has been in part supplied by Mason and Todd, the list is still imperfect even in common words, and still more defective from not including terms of science. Johnson's definitions are constructed often without sufficient consideration, and without any systematic plan; and he frequently errs in tracing the successive significations of a word. Many of Johnson's definitions, moreover, though they may have been accurate in his day, have now become erroneous or defective from the changes, already referred to, that have taken place in our language.

Richardson's dictionary, a work of undoubted merit, may be considered a critical rather than a practical dictionary, and one better adapted for the philological student than the general English reader. Instead of arranging the words in strict alphabetical order, and explaining each separately in its proper place as in common dictionaries, Richardson groups the derivatives under their primitives, and explains each group, or rather the primitive word in each group, by a short running commentary. Thus the verb *to move*, and eighteen derivatives, as *movable*, *movement*, *motion*, *motive*, &c., are classed and braced together, and an explanation given of the verb, while no notice is taken of the distinct meanings of the derivatives, with exception of the word *motive*. No one can consult Richardson's dictionary to any extent without perceiving the inconvenience of this arrangement. Indeed, for all general purposes it is to the ordinary reader little better than a sealed book. In the selection of words admitted as English, Richardson's dictionary is more limited than Johnson's as enlarged by Todd, and scientific and forensic terms are intentionally excluded. On the other hand, it contains a multitude of obsolete words and antiquated derivatives, many of which are of very questionable utility.

Webster's dictionary, which forms the basis of the present work, is acknowledged both in this country and in America to be not only superior to either of the two former, but to every other dictionary hitherto published. It is more copious in its vocabulary, more correct in its definitions, more comprehensive in its plan, and in the etymological department it stands unrivalled. The last edition of Todd's Johnson contains fifty-eight thousand words;—Webster increased the number to seventy thousand. For all practical purposes, the chief value of a dictionary consists in its definitions;—that is, in its giving a clear, accurate, and complete description of all the various shades of meaning which belong, by established usage, to the words of a language. In this department of lexicography Johnson achieved a great deal, and greatly lightened the labours of his successors; but still he left much to be accomplished. Webster has improved such of Johnson's definitions as were defective, corrected such as were erroneous, and added upwards of thirty thousand new definitions, which are distinguished by clearness, terseness, and completeness. In numerous instances also, he has pointed out the distinctions between words apparently synonymous, so that, to a great extent, his dictionary supplies the place of a book of synonymes. Webster spent thirty years of labour upon his dictionary; of these no fewer than ten were devoted to the etymological department alone, which for accuracy and completeness is unequalled. In tracing the origin of English words, he cites from more than twenty different languages which he studied attentively. Indeed, he is the only lexicographer who has adduced the Eastern as well as the European languages in the illustration of the English, and by this means he has thrown much light on the origin and primary signification of many words, and on the affinities between the English and many other languages.

Another important feature of Webster's dictionary is the introduction of the terms of science and art. In this respect it is distinguished from Todd's Johnson, in which thousands of such words are either not inserted, or are explained imperfectly.

Notwithstanding, however, the acknowledged superiority of Webster's dictionary over all others hitherto published, it does not come up to our idea of what a dictionary ought to be, in order fully to meet the wants of the present day. Webster has done much, but he has not done enough. He has omitted many English words and significations in frequent and well-authorized use; his list of scientific and technical terms is not sufficiently copious, and in defining or explaining those he has selected, he has not always consulted the best and most accurate authorities. Some of his definitions likewise have become inaccurate, owing to the progress and the improvements made in the arts and sciences since the time he wrote. There are some other faults of a minor description to be found in Webster, such as wrong accentuations, unwarranted alterations in the orthography of certain words, and instances of false orthoepey.

In adopting Webster's dictionary as the basis of the IMPERIAL DICTIONARY, the great object of the Editor in preparing the latter has been to correct what was wrong and to supply what was wanting in Webster, in order to adapt the new work to the present state of literature, science, and art. Accordingly, every page of Webster has been subjected to a careful examination, numerous alterations and emendations have been made, a vast number of articles have been rewritten, very many of Webster's explanations of important terms have been enlarged, and many new and more correct definitions of others given; new senses have been added to old words, where they were found wanting, and a multitude of new words and terms have been introduced, especially in the scientific and technological departments; so that to Webster's addition of 12,000 words to Todd's Johnson, a further addition has been made of at least 15,000 words and terms.

Generally speaking, the IMPERIAL DICTIONARY aims at containing all purely English words, and all words not English in ordinary use, together with the principal technical and scientific terms, and such as are to be met with in works not purely scientific. More particularly this Dictionary has for its object:—

1. To comprehend all the words contained in Johnson's dictionary, with the additions of Todd and Webster, and words selected from the other standard dictionaries and encyclopedias, together with many thousand words and terms in modern use, not included in any former English dictionary.

2. To exhibit the etymologies of English words, deduced from an examination and comparison of words of corresponding elements in the principal languages of Europe and Asia.

3. To render the pronunciation of words easy and obvious, by accentuation, by marking the sounds of the accented vowels when necessary, by writing the word a second time in different letters when the pronunciation is attended with any difficulty, or by general rules.

4. To give accurate and discriminating definitions of the words, illustrated by examples of their use, selected from the best authors, or by familiar phrases of undoubted authority.

5. To give explanations of Scripture terms and phrases, and when necessary, to cite passages from our common version, not only to illustrate the scriptural or theological sense, but even the ordinary significations of the words.

6. To give accurate definitions and explanations of technical and scientific terms, including those of recent origin, in

Agriculture,	Dynamics,	Husbandry,	Metallurgy,	Phrenology,
Algebra,	Electricity,	Hydrostatics,	Mineralogy,	Pneumatics,
Anatomy,	Engineering,	Hydraulics,	Mining,	Poetry,
Archæology,	Entomology,	Ichthyology,	Music,	Political Economy,
Architecture,	Ethics,	Law (English and	Natural History,	Politics,
Arithmetic,	Fortification,	Scotch),	Natural Philosophy,	Religion,
Arts,	Galvanism,	Logic,	Naval Architecture,	Rhetoric,
Astronomy,	Gardening,	Machinery,	Navigation,	Sculpture,
Botany,	Geography,	Manufactures,	Numismatics,	Statics,
Chemistry,	Geology,	Mathematics,	Optics,	Statuary,
Commerce,	Geometry,	Mechanics,	Ornithology,	Surgery,
Conchology,	Grammar,	Medicine,	Painting,	Surveying,
Divinity,	Gunnery,	Metaphysics,	Perspective,	Trigonometry,
Drawing,	Heraldry,	Meteorology,	Pharmacy,	Zoology, &c. &c. &c.

7. To distinguish words that are obsolete, obsolescent, unusual, partially authorized, colloquial, local, low, or vulgar; care being taken to retain those words which, though now obsolete, occur in our old English authors of celebrity.

8. To introduce such *foreign words* and terms as are frequently met with in English authors, together with some of the more expressive words of the Scottish language.

9. By the assistance of **DIAGRAMS** and **ENGRAVINGS ON WOOD** to furnish clearer ideas of various subjects and objects, and of the signification of various terms, than could be conveyed by mere verbal description. For this reason numerous terms in Architecture, Antiquities, Botany, Zoology, Heraldry, Mechanics, &c., frequently only to be understood by the aid of a figure, have been elucidated and rendered clear by engravings. Besides illustrations of terms, there have been introduced representations of the principal plants used in the arts, manufactures, and in medicine, of animals interesting from their habits or from their value to man, copies of many Mythological figures from celebrated sculptures and paintings, and a variety of other illustrations tending to please, while they also instruct.

Although the **IMPERIAL DICTIONARY** does not profess to contain all the terms of every art and science, yet it will be found to contain the principal and most important, and those which are most generally used, and certainly many more than the general and non-scientific reader is likely to meet with. Especial care has been taken to give explanations, as clear, accurate, and full as possible of terms connected with those sciences and branches of science which are most important in their practical applications; such as Natural Philosophy, Mechanics, Mathematics, Chemistry, and Mineralogy. Of such terms, the number admitted is very great, and also of those employed in Architecture, Engineering, Machinery, Manufactures, Commerce, Agriculture, Geology, Navigation, and Astronomy. In Botany, as it was found impossible to admit all the orders, genera, and species, only those have been selected which are most remarkable, or which are most important in an economical point of view. A similar plan has been adopted with regard to Zoological terms.

Neither labour nor expense has been spared in order to render this dictionary complete in all its departments, and worthy of public approbation. Upwards of ten years of unremitting toil and research have been spent by the Editor in preparing the work. The scientific terms have been revised by individuals of high standing in various departments of science and art, who, besides

securing the accuracy of the definitions of the terms included by the Editor, have also supplied a variety of additional terms, many of them of recent origin. The other additional words and terms have been carefully selected and prepared by reference to the best and most authentic sources.

In selecting the illustrative figures, the greatest care has been taken to secure perfect accuracy; a work of no small difficulty, when the number and variety of sources consulted are taken into account, and when it is remembered that different authorities, especially writers on the natural sciences, often describe the same object under different names. There is no more fruitful source of error in popular works, or of perplexing difficulty to students, than this inconstancy of scientific nomenclature.

The IMPERIAL DICTIONARY will be found to contain, along with the etymologies and the definitions of words and terms, a large amount of useful and interesting information connected with literature, art, and science. A simple inspection of its pages will show, that, wherever it may be opened, it presents something to interest and instruct—some useful fact stated in concise terms—some important maxim or sentiment in religion, morality, law, or civil policy; so that the charge usually preferred against English dictionaries, namely, that they furnish but *dry sort of reading*, will not apply to this dictionary.

Notwithstanding the care that has been bestowed, the Editor is far from supposing that the present work is perfect, or even free from various errors and defects; but he indulges a hope that those of the IMPERIAL DICTIONARY will not be found more in number or greater in magnitude, than might reasonably be expected in an undertaking the execution of which is so difficult and laborious. The utmost efforts of the lexicographer, expended in exhibiting the whole circle of ideas embodied in the language of a highly civilized people, are only an *approximation* towards the great end in view. As the nearest approach yet made to this end, the Editor trusts this work will meet the wants of all those who consult a dictionary with no other view than hastily to remove the difficulty of the moment; that it will be found useful to the more advanced scholar; and that it will prove sufficient for the general purposes of all classes of English readers.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FRONTISPIECE.

THE picture from which our Frontispiece has been engraved, was painted by Raffaele, when under thirty years of age, for Pope Julius II. about the year 1509. It is in fresco, and painted on the wall of one of a superb suite of apartments in the Vatican, called *La camera della Segnatura*. The size of the picture is 26 feet 6½ inches in length, by 15 feet 11 inches in height. Originally named "PHILOSOPHY," but now better known by the very inappropriate name, "THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS," this painting emblemizes the wisdom of the ancients in a representation of the learned men of ancient times. Raffaele has here assembled in a large atrium, in the noble style of Bramante, many teachers of philosophy with their scholars, though living at different periods and in different countries; some are seen imparting instruction to an admiring audience, others demonstrating problems to surrounding pupils, some thoughtful, others communicative; each individual following the bent of his own genius.

Plato, and Aristotle his disciple, occupy the middle of the scene, and are holding a disputation. Plato, the representative of Speculative Philosophy, points upwards with uplifted arm; Aristotle stretches his outspread hand toward the earth, as the source of his Practical Philosophy. At each side, stretching deeper into the picture, a double row of attentive hearers is seen. Near this group, upon the left, Socrates, counting on his fingers, explains his principles and their conclusions to the young warrior Alcibiades, who is recognized by the beauty of his countenance and by his costume. On the opposite side, are placed several persons engaged in different ways, in conversation and study. In the foreground, on both sides, the sciences of Arithmetic and Geometry, with their subordinate studies, occupy separate groups. On the left, as the head of Arithmetic, we observe Pythagoras seated and writing on his knee; a young man holds up to him a tablet, on which are drawn the harmonic chords discovered by that philosopher, and around are his disciples Empedocles, Epicharmus, and Archytas. On the right, Archimedes, bending down, constructs a geometrical figure on a tablet lying on the ground. Several scholars watch his progress; the different degrees of their intelligence being most strikingly depicted. To Archimedes, Raffaele has given the features of his patron and preceptor in architecture and geometry,

DESCRIPTION OF THE FRONTISPIECE.

Bramante, the celebrated architect. Next them are seen, as representing Astronomy and Geography, Zoroaster, the king of Bactria, his head adorned with a radial crown, and holding a celestial globe, and Ptolemy, the geographer, holding a terrestrial globe. Near to Zoroaster are two figures entering the hall, representing Raffaele and Perugino his master in painting. Alone, and seated on the steps, Diogenes, the chief of the cynic philosophers, in a state approaching to nudity, meditates on a tablet which he holds in his hand. A youth, directed by an old man, turns from him to the teachers of a higher philosophy.

“The general arrangement of this painting is most masterly. Plato and Aristotle, with the group of their scholars, are placed together in dignified regularity, without any appearance of stiffness or constraint; on each side and around them greater freedom prevails, with the utmost variety in the attitudes of the figures which compose the groups; while again the leading masses are still balanced most satisfactorily. The style is grand and free; a picturesque unity of effect seems to have been the artist’s aim throughout, and this aim he has attained most perfectly. The taste of design, both in the nude and in drapery, is excellent, and is everywhere guided by the purest sentiment of beauty; the group of youths, in particular, collected round Archimedes, is among the most interesting and natural of Raffaele’s creations.”—*Kugler*.

POINTED LETTERS OR MARKS OF PRONUNCIATION,

AND

ABBREVIATIONS EXPLAINED.

POINTED LETTERS, AND HOW SOUNDED.

Ā, ā, as in <i>fate</i> .	Ē, ē, first <i>a</i> , as in <i>prey</i> .	Ō, ō, long, as in <i>note</i> .	€II, as <i>h</i> .
Ǽ, æ, broad, as in <i>fall</i> .	Ī, ī, long, as in <i>pine</i> .	Ȫ, ð, like <i>oo</i> , as in <i>move</i> .	ČH, as <i>sh</i> .
Ȧ, ȧ, as in <i>what</i> .	Ĭ, ĭ, <i>e</i> long, as in <i>fatigue</i> .	Ū, long, as in <i>tune</i> .	Ġ, as <i>j</i> .
Ȧ, ā, Italian, as in <i>father</i> .	Ȫ, ĭ, short <i>u</i> , as in <i>bird</i> .	Ȫ, as in <i>pull</i> .	TH, vocal, as in <i>that</i> .
Ė, ě, as in <i>mete, meet</i> .	Ȫ, ō, short <i>u</i> , as in <i>dove</i> .	€, as <i>h</i> .	

N.B.—In this DICTIONARY, the letter *e* simply is frequently substituted, both in the beginning and middle of words, for the diphthong *æ*, as *predial* for *prædial*.

ABBREVIATIONS.

<i>a.</i>	stands for adjective.	<i>alge.</i>	stands for algebra.
<i>adv.</i>	" " adverb.	<i>anat.</i>	" " anatomy.
<i>con.</i>	" " connective, or conjunction.	<i>arch.</i>	" " architecture.
<i>exclum.</i>	" " exclamation, or interjection.	<i>arith.</i>	" " arithmetic.
<i>n.</i>	" " name, or noun.	<i>astr.</i>	" " astronomy.
†	" " obsolete, or not used.	<i>astrol.</i>	" " astrology.
<i>pp.</i>	" " participle passive, and perfect.	<i>bot.</i>	" " botany.
<i>ppr.</i>	" " participle of the present tense.	<i>chem.</i>	" " chemistry.
<i>prep.</i>	" " preposition.	<i>colloq.</i>	" " colloquial.
<i>pret.</i>	" " preterite.	<i>com.</i>	" " commerce.
<i>pron.</i>	" " pronoun.	<i>eccles.</i>	" " ecclesiastical.
<i>sing.</i>	" " singular.	<i>entom.</i>	" " entomology.
<i>v. i.</i>	" " verb intransitive.	<i>etym.</i>	" " etymology.
<i>v. t.</i>	" " verb transitive.	<i>fort.</i>	" " fortification.
<i>Ar.</i>	" " Arabic.	<i>geol.</i>	" " geology.
<i>Arm.</i>	" " Armoric.	<i>geom.</i>	" " geometry.
<i>Ch.</i>	" " Chaldee.	<i>gram.</i>	" " grammar.
<i>Corn</i>	" " Cornish.	<i>her.</i>	" " heraldry.
<i>Dan.</i>	" " Danish.	<i>ich.</i>	" " ichthyology.
<i>D.</i>	" " Dutch, or Belgic.	<i>lan.</i>	" " language.
<i>Eng.</i>	" " English, or England.	<i>mar.</i>	" " marine.
<i>Eth.</i>	" " Ethiopic.	<i>math.</i>	" " mathematics.
<i>Fr.</i>	" " French.	<i>mech.</i>	" " mechanics.
<i>G. or Ger.</i>	" " German.	<i>med.</i>	" " medicine.
<i>Gr.</i>	" " Greek.	<i>meta.</i>	" " metaphysics.
<i>Goth.</i>	" " Gothic.	<i>milit.</i>	" " military.
<i>Heb.</i>	" " Hebrew.	<i>min. or mineral.</i>	" " mineralogy.
<i>Ice.</i>	" " Icelandic.	<i>mus.</i>	" " music.
<i>Ir.</i>	" " Irish and Gaelic.	<i>myth.</i>	" " mythology.
<i>It.</i>	" " Italian.	<i>nat. hist.</i>	" " natural history.
<i>Lat. or L.</i>	" " Latin.	<i>nat. order.</i>	" " natural order.
<i>Norm.</i>	" " Norman.	<i>obs. or obsol.</i>	" " obsolete.
<i>Per.</i>	" " Persian, or Persia.	<i>patho.</i>	" " pathology.
<i>Port.</i>	" " Portuguese.	<i>persp.</i>	" " perspective.
<i>Russ.</i>	" " Russian.	<i>phar.</i>	" " pharmacy.
<i>Sam.</i>	" " Samaritan.	<i>phys.</i>	" " physiology.
<i>Sans.</i>	" " Sanscrit.	<i>qu.</i>	" " query.
<i>Sax.</i>	" " Saxon, or Anglo-Saxon.	<i>rhet.</i>	" " rhetoric.
<i>Sp.</i>	" " Spanish.	<i>scrip.</i>	" " scripture.
<i>Sw.</i>	" " Swedish.	<i>sculp.</i>	" " sculpture.
<i>Syr.</i>	" " Syriac.	<i>sur.</i>	" " surgery.
<i>W.</i>	" " Welsh.	<i>theol.</i>	" " theology.
		<i>zool.</i>	" " zoology.

Linn., Linnæus or Linnæan.—*Lit. us.*, Little used.—*Not mu. us.*, Not much used.

INTRODUCTION.

DEFINITION OF LANGUAGE.

LANGUAGE or *Speech* is the utterance of articulate sounds or voices, rendered significant by usage, for the expression and communication of thoughts.

According to this definition, language belongs exclusively to intellectual and intelligent beings, and, among terrestrial beings, to man only; for no animal on earth, except man, can pronounce words. The word *language* is sometimes used in a more comprehensive sense, and applied to the sounds by which irrational animals express their feelings or affections; as to the neighing of the horse, the lowing of the ox, the barking of the dog, and to the cackling and chirping of fowls; for the sounds uttered by these animals are perfectly understood by the respective species. So also language is figuratively applied to the signs by which deaf and dumb persons manifest their ideas; for these are instruments of communicating thoughts.

But language in its proper sense, as the medium of intercourse between men, or rational beings, endowed with the faculty of uttering articulate sounds, is the subject now to be considered.

Written language is the representation of significant sounds by letters, or characters, single or combined in words, arranged in due order, according to usage.

ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

We read in the Scriptures, that God, when he had created man, "Blessed them; and said to them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea," &c. God afterward planted a garden, and placed in it the man he had made, with a command to keep it, and to dress it; and he gave him a rule of moral conduct, in permitting him to eat the fruit of every tree in the garden, except one, the eating of which was prohibited. We further read, that God brought to Adam the fowls and beasts he had made, and that Adam gave them names; and that when his female companion was made, he gave her a name. After the eating of the forbidden fruit, it is stated that God addressed Adam and Eve, reproving them for their disobedience, and pronouncing the penalties which they had incurred. In the account of these transactions, it is further related that Adam and Eve both replied to their Maker, and excused their disobedience.

If we admit what is the literal and obvious interpretation of this narrative, that vocal sounds or words were used in these communications between God and the progenitors of the human race, it results that Adam was not only endowed with intellect for understanding his Maker, or the signification of words, but was furnished both with the faculty of speech and with speech itself, or the knowledge and use of words as signs of ideas, and this before the formation of the woman. Hence, we may infer that language was bestowed on Adam, in the same manner as all his other faculties and knowledge, by supernatural power; or, in other words, was of divine origin: for supposing Adam to have had all the intellectual powers of any adult individual of the species who has since lived, we cannot admit as probable, or even possible, that he should have invented and constructed even a barren language, as soon as he was created, without supernatural aid. It may, indeed, be doubted, whether, without such aid, men would ever have learned the use of the organs of speech, so far as to form a language. At any rate, the invention of words and the construction of a language

must have been by a slow process, and must have required a much longer time than that which passed between the creation of Adam and of Eve. It is therefore probable that *language*, as well as the faculty of speech, was the *immediate gift of God*. We are not, however, to suppose the language of our first parents in paradise to have been copious, like most modern languages; or the identical language they used, to be now in existence. Many of the primitive radical words may and probably do exist in various languages; but observation teaches that languages must improve and undergo great changes as knowledge increases, and be subject to continual alterations, from other causes incident to men in society.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE PRINCIPAL LANGUAGES, ANCIENT AND MODERN, THAT HAVE BEEN SPOKEN BY NATIONS BETWEEN THE GANGES AND THE ATLANTIC OCEAN.

We learn from the Scriptures that Noah, who, with his family, was preserved from destruction by the Deluge, for the purpose of re-peopling the earth, had three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. This fact, a little obscured by tradition, was retained by our rude German ancestors, to the age of Tacitus.*

Japheth was the eldest son; but Shem, the ancestor of the Israelites and of the writers of the Scriptures, is named first in order.

The descendants of Shem and Ham peopled all the great plain situated north and west of the Persian Gulf, between that Gulf and the Indian Ocean on the east, and the Arabic Gulf and the Mediterranean Sea on the west, with the northern coast of Africa; comprehending Assyria, Babylonia or Chaldea, Syria, Palestine, Arabia, Egypt, and Libya. The principal languages or dialects used by these descendants, are known to us under the names of Chaldee, or Chaldaic, which is called also Aramean, Syriac, Hebrew, Arabic, Ethiopic, Samaritan, and Coptic. Of these, the Chaldee and Hebrew are no longer living languages, but they have come down to us in books: the Samaritan is probably extinct or lost in the modern languages of the country, but the language survives in a copy of the Pentateuch; the Coptic is nearly or quite extinct, and little of it remains; the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic are yet living languages, but they have suffered and are continually suffering alterations, from which no living language is exempt.

These languages, except the Coptic, being used by the descendants of Shem, we call *Shemitic*, or *Assyrian*, in distinction from the *Japhetic*. As the descendants of Japheth peopled Asia Minor, the northern parts of Asia, about the Euxine and Caspian, and all Europe, their languages have, in the long period that has elapsed since their dispersion, become very numerous.

All languages having sprung from one source, the original words from which they have been formed must have been of equal antiquity. That the Celtic and Teutonic languages in Europe are, in this sense, as old as the Chaldee and Hebrew, is a fact not only warranted by history and the common origin

* Celebrant, carminibus antiquis, Tuistonem deum terræ editum, et filium Mannum, originem gentis conditoresque. Manno tres filios assignant.—*De Mor. Germ.* 2.

"In ancient songs they celebrate Tuisto, a god sprung from the earth, and his son Mannus (Man), the origin and founders of their nation. To Mannus they assign three sons."

Noah is here called Man.

of Japheth and Shem, but susceptible of proof from the identity of many words yet existing in both stocks. But there is a marked difference between the Shemitic and Japhetic languages; for even when the radical words are unquestionably the same, the modifications, or inflections and combinations which form the compounds, are, for the most part, different.

As it has been made a question which of the Shemitic languages is the most ancient, and much has been written to prove it to be the Hebrew, we will state briefly our opinion on what appears to us to be one of the plainest questions in the history of nations. We have for our certain guides, in determining this question—1st, The historical narrative of facts in the Book of Genesis; and 2d, The known and uniform progress of languages, within the period of authentic profane history.

1. The Scripture informs us that before the dispersion, the whole earth was of one language and of one or the same speech; and that the descendants of Noah journeyed from the east, and settled on the plain of Shinar, or in Chaldea. The language used at that time, by the inhabitants of that plain, must then have been the oldest or the primitive language of man. This must have been the original Chaldee.

2. The Scripture informs us, that in consequence of the impious attempts of the people to build a city, and a tower whose top might reach to heaven, with a view to make themselves a name and prevent their dispersion, God interposed and confounded their language, so that they could not understand each other; in consequence of which they were dispersed "from thence over the face of all the earth."

3. If the confusion of languages at Babel originated the differences which gave rise to the various languages of the families which separated at the dispersion, then those several languages are all of equal antiquity. Of these the Hebrew, as a distinct language, was not one; for the Hebrew nation was of posterior origin.

4. All the words of the several great races of men, both in Asia and Europe, which are vernacular in their several languages, and unequivocally the same, are of equal antiquity, as they must have been derived from the common Chaldee stock which existed before the dispersion. The words common to the Syrians and Hebrews could not have been borrowed from the Hebrew; for the Hebrews originated from Heber and Abram, several centuries after Syria and Egypt were populous countries. This fact is attested by the Scripture history, which declares that when Abram migrated from Chaldea, and came into Canaan or Palestine, "the Canaanite was then in the land;" and when he returned from Egypt, "the Perizzite dwelt in the land." These declarations, and the history of Abimelech, and of the war of four kings or chieftains with five; as also of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, prove Syria to have been at that time well peopled. The language of the inhabitants, then, must have been coeval with the nation, and long anterior to the Hebrew as a distinct dialect. It may be added, that in the early periods of the world, when no books existed, nations, living remote or distinct, never borrowed words from each other. One nation living in the midst of another, as the Hebrews did among the Egyptians, may adopt a single word, or a few words; but a family of words thus adopted, is an occurrence rarely or never known. The borrowing of words, in modern times, is almost wholly from the use of books.

5. It is probable that some differences of language were produced by the confusion; but neither that event nor any supernatural event is necessary to account for the differences of dialect or of languages now existing. The different modern languages of the Gothic or Teutonic stock, all originated in the natural course of events: and the differences are as great between them as they are between the languages of the Shemitic stock.

6. Soon after two races of men of a common stock have separated and placed themselves in distant countries, the language of each begins to diverge from that of the other, by various means.—1. One tribe or nation will suffer one word to become obsolete and be forgotten; another, will suffer the loss of another; sometimes a whole family of words will be lost; at other times, a part only; at other times, a single word only of a numerous family will be retained by one nation, while another nation will retain the whole. 2. The same word will

be differently applied by two distant races of men, and the difference will be so great as to obscure the original affinity. 3. Words will be compounded by two nations in a different manner, the same radical words taking a different prefix or suffix, in different languages. Thus *wisdom* in English is in German *weisheit*, [wise-head, wisdom,] from *wise, weis*. The English *misdread* is in Danish *fjörled*, from *lead, leder*.

4. The pronunciation and orthography of words will often be so much changed, that the same word in two languages cannot, without difficulty, be recognized as identical. No person, without a considerable attention to the changes which letters have suffered, would at once suspect or believe the English *let* and the French *laisser* to be the same word.

7. As Abram migrated from Chaldea, he must have spoken the Chaldee language; and probably, at that time, the Syriac, Arabic, and Egyptian, had not become so different, as to render it impracticable for him to converse with the inhabitants of Palestine and Egypt. But the language of Abram's descendants, and that of the land of Shinar or the Chaldee, must, in the natural course of things, have begun to diverge soon after the separation; and the changes in each language being different, would, in the course of a few centuries, form somewhat different languages. So in the days of Hezekiah, the Syriac and Hebrew had become, in a degree, distinct languages; 2 Kings xviii. In which of these languages the greatest number of alterations were produced, we do not know; but it would appear that the Chaldee dialect, in the use of dental letters instead of sibilants, is much the most general in the Celtic and Teutonic languages of Europe. Thus the German only has a sibilant in *wasser*, when the other Teutonic languages have a dental, *water*. We think also that there are far more words in the European languages which accord with the Chaldee or Arabic, than there are words which accord with the Hebrew. If this observation is well founded, the Hebrew must have suffered the loss of more primitive words than the other languages of the Shemitic family. This, however, is true, that all of them have lost some words, and in some cases the Hebrew retains what the others have lost.

8. The Hebrew Scriptures are, by many centuries, the most ancient writings extant. Hence probably the strange inference, that the Hebrew is the oldest language; as if the inhabitants of Chaldea and Syria had had no language for ages before the progenitor of the Hebrews was born.

9. The vernacular words in the Celtic and Teutonic languages of modern Europe, which are evidently the same words as still exist in the Shemitic languages, are of the same antiquity; being a part of the common language which was used on the plain of Shinar, before the dispersion.

The descendants of Japheth peopled the northern part of Asia, and all Europe; or if some colonies from Egypt planted themselves in Greece at an early period, they or their descendants must have been merged in the mass of Japhetic population. Certain it is that the Greek language is chiefly formed on the same radical words as the Celtic and Teutonic languages.

The Japhetic tribes of men, whose descendants peopled the south and west of Europe, were first established in the country now called Persia, or, by the natives themselves, Iran. Of this fact, the evidence now existing is decisive. The numerous words found in the Greek, Latin, Gaelic, English, and the kindred tongues, which are still used in Persia, prove, beyond all question, that Persia must have been the residence of the people whose descendants introduced into Europe the languages from which the modern languages are derived. The fact proves further, that a great body of the original Persians remained in their own country, and their descendants constitute the mass of the population at this day.

In the early stages of society, men dwelt or migrated in families, tribes, or clans. The family of Abraham and Jacob in Asia, and the clans of the Gaels in Scotland, exhibit to us the manner in which societies and nations were originally formed. The descendants of a man settled around him, and formed a clan, or tribe, of which the government was patriarchal. Such families often migrated in a body, and often the personal characteristics of the progenitor might be distinctly traced in his descendants for many generations. In process of time, some of these families became nations; more generally,

by means of wars and migrations, different tribes became blended, and the distinction of families was lost.

In rude ages, the families or tribes of men are named from some characteristic of the people; or, more generally, from the place of their residence. The Greeks gave the name of *Seythia* to the north of Europe and Asia, but the primitive inhabitants of the west of Europe they called *Κέλται*, *Kelts*, *Celts*, a word signifying *woods men*.* These were descendants from the same ancestors as the Greeks and Romans themselves, but they had pushed their migrations into Gaul, Spain and Britain. The first settlers or occupiers of these countries were driven forward by successive hordes, until they were checked by the ocean; there they made their stand, and there we find their descendants at this day. These may be considered as the descendants of the earliest settlers or first inhabitants of the countries where they are found. Among these are the inhabitants of France, south of the Garonne, and those of the north of Spain, called by the Romans Aquitani and Cantabri, in more modern times Gascoigna, Basques, and Cantabrians, who still retain their native language; and in Great Britain, the Gaels in Scotland, and the natives of the north and west of Ireland, who also retain their primitive language.†

The first inhabitants of the north and west of Europe, known to the Greeks and Romans, to whom we are indebted for our earliest accounts of that region, were the Cimbri, who inhabited the peninsula of Denmark, now called Jutland, and the tribes which belonged to the Teutonic and Gothic races which were established in Germany and on both sides of the Baltic. Whether tribes of Celtic origin had overspread the latter countries before the arrival of the Gothic and Teutonic races, and all Europe had been inhabited by the Celts even to the borders of Sarmatia, has been a question much disputed by historians and antiquaries. The German and French writers generally contend that the Celts inhabited all the north of Europe, as far at least as Sarmatia; but some respectable English writers are of a different opinion. Now it is agreed that the Welsh are descendants of the Cimbri, inhabitants of Jutland; and their language bears a strong affinity to the Celtic languages which still exist; a fact that countenances the opinion of the German and French writers. But the dispute is of little moment: the Celtic, Teutonic and Gothic races being all of the Japhetic stock, migrating from Asia through Asia Minor at different times, and pursuing different courses westward. The first tribes probably sought the warm climates along the north coast of the Mediterranean, and established themselves in Greece and Italy. Others followed the course of the Danube and its subsidiary streams, till they fell upon the rivers that conducted them to the Baltic. The first inhabitants of Greece and Italy were probably of the Celtic race; but if they were, it is very evident that tribes of the Teutonic or Gothic races invaded those countries before they were civilized, and intermingled with the original inhabitants. The Pelasgi may have

been among the number. This is an inference which we draw from the affinities of the Greek and Latin languages with those of Teutonic origin. The Teutonic and Gothic races impressed their language upon all the continent of Europe west of the Vistula, and from that river to the Rhine, or rather to the Seine, anterior to the conquest of Gaul by Julius Cesar. The same races invading and conquering the south of Europe, in the fourth and fifth centuries, on the downfall of the Roman empire, infused a portion of their language into the Italian and Spanish, which is still distinguishable.

The ancient Sarmatia, including Poland and Russia, was probably peopled originally by races of men who passed into Europe by the country north of the Euxine. Their original residence was along the rivers Kur and Araxes, or on the mountains between the Euxine and Caspian. The name of the *Russ* or Russians is clearly recognized in the *Roxolani* of Pliny and Ptolemy, and possibly the ancestors of this race may have entered Europe by Asia Minor. That the Teutonic races, originally from Persia, inhabited Asia Minor, and migrated westward by that course, is evident from the names which they impressed on mountains, rivers and places. Such are the *Cragus* of Pliny, the Welsh and English *crag*;‡ *Perga* in Pamphylia, now *burg* or *bergen*; *Thymbreck*, the name of a small stream, near the site of Troy; a word in which we recognize the English *brook*; it was contracted by the Greeks into *Thymbrus*.§

It is admitted by all gentlemen acquainted with oriental literature, that the Sanscrit, or ancient language of India, the parent of all the dialects of that great peninsula, is radically the same language or from the same stock as the Greek and Latin; the affinities between them being remarkably clear and decisive. If so, the inhabitants of India and the descendants of the Celtic and Teutonic nations are all of one family, and must have all migrated from one country after the separation of the nations of the Shemitic stock from those of the Japhetic race.||

Whether that country was Persia, or Cashmir, or a country further east, is a point not easily determined. One important inference results from this fact, that the white men of Europe and the black or tawny men of India, are direct descendants from a common ancestor.

Of the languages of Europe, the Greek was first improved and refined, and next to that the Latin. The affinity between these languages and those of the west and north of Europe is very striking, and demonstrates their common origin. It is probable, however, that there are some words in the Greek derived from Africa, if Egyptian colonies were established in Greece, as historians inform us.

The modern Italian, Spanish, French and Portuguese, are composed chiefly of Latin words, much altered, however, both in orthography and inflections. Perhaps nine tenths of all the words now found in those languages are of Latin origin; being introduced by the Romans, who held Gaul in subjection five or six centuries, and Spain much longer; or being borrowed from Latin authors, since the revival of letters. All these languages, however, retain many words of Celtic origin; the primitive language not having been entirely extirpated. In some instances, the same word has been transmitted through both channels, the Celtic and the Latin, and is yet retained. Thus in French *céder*, and in Italian *cedere*, is directly from the Latin *cedo*; while the French *congedier*, and Italian *congedare*, are composed of the same word, with a prefix, derived from the Celtic, and retained in the Welsh *gadaw*, to quit, to leave, [*L. concedo*.] And this same verb probably appears also in *quit*, a word common to the Teutonic and to the Celtic languages. See *Conge* in the Dictionary.

It must be observed further, that the Spanish language contains some words of African origin, introduced by the Carthaginians before the Roman conquest of Spain, or afterward by the Moors, who for several centuries were masters of that country. It contains also some words of Gothic origin, intro-

* Welsh *cell*, a cover or shelter, a *Celt*; *celtiad*, an inhabitant of the covert or wood; *celu*, to conceal, Lat. *celo*. In Gaelic the word is *coill* or *ceill*. The Celts were originally a tribe or nation inhabiting the north of Italy, or the still more northern territory.

† We purposely omit all consideration of the different families, tribes or nations which first peopled Greece and Italy. In Greece, we read of the Ἑλλήες or Ἑλληνες, the Hellenes, the Achæans, the Dorians, the Æoliæns, the Ionians, the Pelasgi, &c. In Italy, of the Ælyrians, the Liburni, the Siculi, the Veneti or Heneti, the Iberi, Ligures, Sicani, Etrusci, Insubres, Sabini, Latini, Samnites, and many others. But as these nations or their descendants gave the name of *Celts* to the Umbri, or nations that dwelt in the north, in the less cultivated parts of Europe, and to the inhabitants of Gaul; and as all the tribes, under whatever denomination they were known, were branches of the great Japhetic stock, we shall call them by that general name, *Celts*; and under the general name of Goths or Teutons, shall comprehend the various tribes that inhabited the north of Germany, and the country north of the Baltic or Scandinavia.

‡ A late writer seems to consider the Teutonic races as the only ancestors of the Greeks and Romans. But from Celtic words still found in the Greek and Latin, words not belonging to any of the Gothic or Teutonic languages, it is demonstrably certain that the primitive settlers in Greece and Italy belonged to the Celtic races. Thus the Greek *βραχίον*, Lat. *brachium*, the arm, is formed on the Gaelic *braigh*, *raigh*, *W. braic*, a word not found among the Teutonic nations. So the Welsh *mociaw*, to mock, is found in the Greek *μοιχεύω*, and French *moquer*, to mock, and *Ir. mogadh*, a mocking; but not in any of the Gothic or Teutonic languages. Many similar facts prove that the Celtic races were among the earliest inhabitants of Greece.

§ Plin. H. N. lib. 5. cap. 27. Strabo, lib. 7. 6, informs us that the Dalmatians had the singular practice of making a division of their fields every eighth year. Hence perhaps the name, from *deal*, and *math* or *madh*, country.

|| See *Clarke's Travels*.

¶ See the word *Chuk* in the Dictionary.

duced by the Goths who conquered that country, at the downfall of the Roman Empire. The French also contains some words of Teutonic origin, either from the Belgic tribes who occupied the country to the Seine at the time of Cesar's invasion, or from the Franks who established the dynasty of the Merovingian kings in the fifth century, or from the Normans who obtained possession of the northern part of that kingdom in the tenth century, or from all these sources.

The German, Dutch or Belgic, Anglo-Saxon, Danish and Swedish languages, are of Teutonic or Gothic origin.* They are all closely allied; a great part of the words in them all being the same or from the same roots, with different prefixes or affixes. There is, however, a greater difference between the Danish and Swedish, which are of the Gothic stock, and the German and Dutch, which are of Teutonic origin, than between two languages of the same stock, as between the Danish and Swedish. The Norwegian, Icelandic, and some of the languages or dialects of Switzerland, belong to the same stock.

The basque or Cantabrian in Spain; the Gaelic in the north of Scotland, and the Hiberno-Celtic or native language of Ireland, are the purest remains of the ancient Celtic. From a comparison of a vocabulary of the Gaelic and Hiberno-Celtic, we find little or no difference between them; and from a long and attentive examination of this language, and of the languages of Teutonic origin, we find less difference between them than most authors have supposed to exist.

The Armoric language of Brittany in the northwest angle of France, and the Cornish, in the southwest of England, are also of Celtic origin. The Cornish is now extinct; but the Armoric is a living language.

The English, as now spoken, is a language composed of words from several others. The basis of the language is Anglo-Saxon, or, as we shall, for the sake of brevity, call it, Saxon, by which it is closely allied to the languages of Teutonic and Gothic origin on the continent. But it retains a great number of words from the ancient languages of Britain, the Belgic or Loegrian, and the Cymraeg or Welsh, particularly from the latter, and some from the Cornish. Cesar informs us, that before he invaded Britain, Belgic colonies had occupied the southern coast of England; and the inhabitants of the interior, northern and western parts, were the ancestors of the present Welsh, who call themselves *Cymry*, and their country *Cymru*, a name which indicates their origin from the Cimbrî, inhabitants of the modern Denmark, or Cimbric Chersonese, now Jutland.

The modern English contains many Latin words introduced by the Romans, who had possession of Britain for five hundred years. But the body of the language is probably their vernacular tongue. It is more nearly allied to the languages of Celtic origin, than to those of the Teutonic and Gothic stock; and of this British language, the Cornish and Armoric are dialects.

It has been commonly supposed that the Britons were nearly exterminated by the Saxons, and that the few that survived, escaped into the west of England, now Wales. It is true that many took refuge in Wales, which their descendants still retain; but it cannot be true that the other parts of England were entirely depopulated. On the other hand, great numbers must have escaped slaughter, and been intermixed with their Saxon conquerors. The Welsh words, which now form no unimportant part of the English language, afford decisive evidence of this fact. It is probable, however, that these words were for a long time used only by the common people, for few of them appear in the early Saxon writers.

The English contains also many words introduced by the Danes, who were for some time masters of England; which words are not found in the Saxon. These words prevail most in the northern counties of England; but many of them are incorporated into the body of the language.

After the Conquest, the Norman kings endeavoured to extirpate the English language, and substitute the Norman. For this purpose, it was ordained that all law proceedings and records should be in the Norman language; and hence the early records and reports of law cases came to be written in Norman.

But neither royal authority, nor the influence of courts, could change the vernacular language. After an experiment of three hundred years, the law was repealed; and since that period, the English has been, for the most part, the official, as well as the common language of the nation. A few Norman words, however, remain in the English; most of them in law language.

Since the Conquest, the English has not suffered any shock from the intermixture of conquerors with the natives of England; but the language has undergone great alterations, by the disuse of a large portion of Saxon words, and the introduction of words from the Latin and Greek languages, with some French, Italian, and Spanish words. These words have, in some instances, been borrowed by authors directly from the Latin and Greek; but most of the Latin words have been received through the medium of the French and Italian. For terms in the sciences, authors have generally resorted to the Greek; and from this source, as discoveries in science demand new terms, the vocabulary of the English language is receiving continual augmentation. We have also a few words from the German and Swedish, mostly terms in mineralogy; and commerce has introduced new commodities of foreign growth or manufacture, with their foreign names, which now make a part of our language.—Such are *camphor*, *amber*, *arsenic*, and many others.

The English then is composed of,

1st, Saxon and Danish words of Teutonic and Gothic origin.
2nd, British or Welsh, Cornish and Armoric, which may be considered as of Celtic origin.

3rd, Norman, a mixture of French and Gothic.

4th, Latin, a language formed on the Celtic and Teutonic.

5th, French, chiefly Latin corrupted, but with a mixture of Celtic.

6th, Greek, formed on the Celtic and Teutonic, with some Coptic.

7th, A few words directly from the Italian, Spanish, German, and other languages of the continent.

8th, A few foreign words, introduced by commerce, or by political and literary intercourse.

Of these, the Saxon words constitute our mother tongue; being words which our ancestors brought with them from Asia. The Danish and Welsh also are primitive words, and may be considered as a part of our vernacular language. They are of equal antiquity with the Chaldee and Syriac.

AFFINITY OF LANGUAGES.

On comparing the structure of the different languages of the Shemitic and Japhetic stocks, we cannot but be struck with the fact, that although a great number of words consisting of the same or of cognate letters, and conveying the same ideas, are found in them all; yet in the inflections, and in the manner of forming compounds and derivatives, there are remarkable differences between the two great families. In the modifications of the verb, for expressing person, time, and mode or mood, very little resemblance is observable between them. If we could prove that the personal terminations of the verb, in the Japhetic languages, were originally pronouns, expressive of the persons, we should prove an affinity between the words of the two races in a most important particular. Some attempts of this kind have been made, but not with very satisfactory results.†

In the formation of nouns, we recognize a resemblance between the English termination *th*, in *birth*, *truth*, *drouth*, [Saxon *drugoth*,] *warmth*, &c., and the Shemitic terminations *ni* and *ni*; the old plural termination *en*, retained in *oxen*, and the Welsh plural ending *ion*, coincide nearly with the

Arabic termination of the dual number *an*, and the regular masculine plural termination *on*, as well as with the Chaldee, Hebrew, and Syriac *in*. And it is justly remarked by Mitford, that in the variety of plural terminations of nouns, there is a striking resemblance between the Arabic and the Welsh. There is one instance, in the modern lan-

* In strictness, the Swedish and Danish are of Gothic origin, and the German and Saxon, of Teutonic origin.

† According to Dr. Edwards, there is a remarkable resemblance between the Shemitic languages and the Muhhekanew, or Mohegan, one of the native languages of New England, in the use of the pronouns as prefixes and affixes to verbs.—*Observations*, &c. p. 13.

guages of Teutonic origin, in which we find the Arabic nunnation:—this is the German and Dutch *binnen*, the Saxon *binnan* or *binnon*, signifying *within*, Hebrew and Chaldee *בין*,

Ar. *بين* *bin*, without the mark of nunnation when it signifies *within*; but when it signifies separation, space, interval, the

original sense, it is written *بين*, and pronounced, with the nunnation, like the Teutonic word *binnon*.

One mode of forming nouns from verbs in the Shemitic languages is by prefixing *m*. We know of no instance of this manner of formation in the Japhetic languages, except in some names which are of oriental origin. Mars is said to be from *am*, but if so, the word was undoubtedly formed in the East. So we find *Morpheus*, the god of sleep, to be probably formed with the prefix *m*, from the Ethiopic *ሠዕል* *aor*, to rest, to fall asleep; whence we infer that *Morpheus* is sleep deified.*

But as many words in all the languages of Europe and Asia are formed with prepositions, perhaps it may be found on examination, that some of these prefixes may be common to the families of both stocks, the Japhetic and the Shemitic. We find in German *gemüth*, in Dutch *gemoed*, from *muth*, mood, mind, mood. We find *mad* in Saxon is *gemaad*; *polish*, the Latin *polio*, is in Welsh *caboli*; *mail* in Italian is both *maglia* and *camaglia*; *belief* in Saxon is *gelaef*, and in German *glaube*. We find that in the Shemitic languages *כָּל* signifies

to fill or be full, and we find in the Arabic *كَمَل* *kamala*, has the same signification. In Syriac, *ܕܐܓܠ* *gal*, signifies to

remove; and *ܕܐܓܠ* *kagal*, signifies to wander in mind, to

be delirious. In Chaldee and Syriac, *ܕܡܝܪ* is to wonder, precisely the Latin *demiror*, which is a compound of *de* and *miror*.

We find also that nations differ in the orthography of some initial sounds, where the words are the same. Thus the Spanish has *llamar*, *llorar*, for the Latin *clamo*, *ploro*; and the Welsh has *llawr*, for the English *floor*, *llabi*, a tall, lank person, coinciding with *flabby*, *llac* for *slack*, and the like.

As the prepositions and prefixes, in all languages, constitute an important class of words, being used in composition to vary the sense of other parts of speech, to an almost unlimited extent, it may be useful to give them a particular consideration.

The simple prepositions are, for the most part, verbs or participles, or derived from them; when verbs, they are the radical or primary word, sometimes varied in orthography by the addition or alteration of a single vowel, or perhaps, in some cases, by the loss of the initial consonant, or aspirate. Such are the Greek *παρά*, *πρός*, *κατά*; the Latin *con* and *per*; the English *for*, which retain their original consonants. The following, *of*, *by*, *in*, *on*, *un*; the Latin *ab*, *ad*, *pro*, *præ*, *re*; the Greek *ἀπό*, *ἐν*, *ἐπί*, *ὑπέρ*, may have lost the initial or final consonants; *of* for *hof*; *in* for *hin*; *ab* for *hab*; *pro* for *prod*. In some words this loss can only be conjectured; in others, it is known or obvious. Thus the English *by* and *be* was originally *big*, as it is in the Saxon; and the Latin *re* is written also *red*, evidently a derivative of an Arabic verb still existing; the Latin *sub* and *super* are formed probably from the Greek *ὑπό*, *ὑπέρ*, by the change of an aspirate into *s*, or the Greek words have lost that letter. The English *but* in the phrase "They are all here but one," is a participle; the Saxon *butan*, or *buton*; Dutch *buiten*, from *buijen*, to rove. Among is the Saxon *gemang* the verb, or the participle of *gemengan*, to mingle.

In general, the primary sense of the preposition is moving, or moved. Thus *to* in English, and *ad* in Latin, primarily denote advancing toward a place or object; as in the sentence, "We are going to town." *From*, *of*, Lat. *ab*, Gr. *ἀπό*, denote motion from a place or object. The French *près*, is from the

Italian *presso*, and this is the Latin participle *pressus*, pressed; hence it denotes *near*, *close*.

In some instances prepositions are compounds, as the English *before*; that is, *be* or *by fore*, by the front; and the Fr. *auprès*, at or near.

Prepositions, from their frequent use and from the ease with which their primary signification is modified to express differences of position, motion, or relation, as occasions demand, have, in many instances, a great variety of applications; not, indeed, as many as lexicographers sometimes assign to them, but several different, and sometimes opposite significations; as, for examples, the English *for*, *with*; the Latin *con*, and the Greek *κατά*. *For*, which is from the root of the Saxon *faran*, Gr. *σπρίνυμα*, to pass, denotes *toward*, as in the phrase, "A ship bound for Jamaica;" or it denotes *in favour of*, as "This measure is *for* the public benefit;" or "The present is *for* a friend." But it denotes also opposition or negation, as in *forbear*, *forgive*, *forbid*.

With is a verb, but has rather the sense of a participle. It is found in the Gothic with a prefix, *ga-withan*, to join or unite. Its primary sense then is joined, close; hence, in company; as in the sentences—"Go with him," "Come with me." It has the sense also of *from*, *against*, *contrariety*, *opposition*, as in *withdraw*, *withstand*, *without*. In Saxon it had also the sense of *toward*, as "*with eorþan*," toward the earth; also of *for*, denoting substitution or equivalent in exchange, as "*sylan with dagas weorce*," to give for a day's work; also of *opposite*, *over against*, as "*with tha sæ*," opposite the sea.

Con in Latin generally signifies *with*, *toward*, or *to*, denoting closeness or union, approach, joint operation and the like, as in *concurro*, *conjungo*, *congregior*; but it has also the sense of *against* or *opposition*, as in *contendo*.

The Greek *κατά* is doubtless from the root of the English *fare*, Saxon *faran*, to go, to pass. It signifies *from*, that is, departure—also *at*, *to*, Lat. *ad*; *near*, *with*, *beyond*, and *against*.

To understand the cause of the different and apparently contrary significations, we are to attend to the primary sense. The effect of passing to a place is nearness, *at*, *presso*, *près*, and this may be expressed by the participle, or, in a contracted form, by the verb. The act of passing or moving toward a place, readily gives the sense of such prepositions as *to*, and the Latin *ad*, and this advance may be in favour or for the benefit of a person or thing, the primary sense of which may perhaps be best expressed by *toward*; "A present or a measure is *toward* him." But when the advance of one thing toward another is in enmity or opposition, we express the sense by *against*, and this sense is especially expressed when the motion or approach is in front of a person, or intended to meet or counteract another motion. Hence the same word is often used to express both senses; the context determining which signification is intended. Thus *for* in English, in the sentence, "He that is not *for* us is against us," denotes *in favour of*. But in the phrase, "*for* all that," it denotes opposition. "It rains, but *for* all that, we will take a ride," that is, in opposition to that, or notwithstanding the rain, we will ride.

The Greek *ὑπέρ*, among other senses, signifies *beyond*, that is, past, and *over*, Hebrew *על*.

The prepositions which are used as distinct words, are called separable prepositions, or more generally *prepositions*:—those which are used only in composition are called inseparable prepositions. For the sake of brevity, we give to all words or single letters, prefixed to other words in composition, the general name of *prefixes*.

One of the best modes of ascertaining the true sense of a preposition, is, to examine its various uses in composition, and discover what effect it has in modifying the signification of the word to which it is prefixed.

Prepositions, used in compounds, often suffer the loss or change of a letter, for the sake of euphony, or the ease of pronunciation. Thus *ad* in Latin becomes *f* in *affero*; *con* becomes *col* in *coligo*; the Greek *κατά* loses a letter in *καταίμι*, as does *κατά* in many words.

The following sketch of the principal prepositions and prefixes in several languages of Europe, will exhibit some of the affinities of these languages, and, in a degree, illustrate the uses of this class of words.

SAXON AND GOTHIC.

And, Saxon and Gothic, signifies *against*, *opposite*. This is the Greek *αντι*, and Latin *ante*, not borrowed from the Greek or Latin, but a native word. Examples, *andstandan*, to stand against, to resist; *andswarian*, *answarian*, to answer; that is, to speak again, against, or in return.

Amb, *emb*, *ymb*, usually *emb*, Saxon, signifying *about*, *around*; coinciding with the Latin *amb*, and Greek *αμφι*. Example, *emb-faran*, to go around, to walk about; *embutan*, about; *emb*, about; and *butan*, without. See *But*. *Ambeht*, *embeht*, *ymbeht*, office, duty; whence we have *ambassador*. This in Gothic is *andbahtei*; and a bailiff, minister, or servant, is *andbahta*. The Germans have the word contracted in *amt*, charge, office, Dutch *amt*, Danish *amt*. The Gothic orthography gives rise to the question whether *amb*, *emb*, and *avri*, Saxon and Gothic *and*, are not radically the same word; and it is very certain that the Gothic and Saxon *and*, is radically the same word as the Latin *in*, Danish *ind*. So in Gothic, "*and wigans*," in the ways, into the highways; Luke xiv. 23; "*and haimos*," per vicus, through the towns; Luke ix. 6.

This preposition, *amb*, is in Dutch *om*; in German *um*; in Swedish and Danish *om*.

At, is a Gothic preposition and prefix, coinciding with English *at*, Latin *ad*.

Be, in Saxon, as a preposition and prefix, is always written *be*, or *big*, answering to the English *by*, a preposition, and *be* in *beset*. In Gothic, it is written *bi*, *by* and *be*, being contractions of *big*. The primary and principal signification is *near*, *close*; as "Stand or sit *by* me." So in the word *bystander*. It is a prefix of extensive use in the Saxon, German, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish. Its use in denoting instrumentality, may be from the sense of *nearness*, but more probably it is from *passing*, like *per*, through, or it denotes *proceeding from*, like *of*, as "Salvation is *of* the Lord."

For, in Saxon, as in English, is a preposition and prefix of extensive use. In Saxon *for* signifies a going, from *faran*, to go, to fare. It is radically the same word as *fore*, in the sense of *in front*, *before*. Its primary sense is *advancing*; hence *moving toward*; hence the sense of *in favour of*, and that of opposition, or negation. See the preceding remarks.

This word in German is *für*, but with this orthography, the word is little used in composition. Yet the German has *fürbitte*, intercession or praying for; *fürwort*, intercession, recommendation, and a pronoun [*for-word*.] and *für-wahr*, forsooth.

In the sense of *fore*, the German has *vor*, a word of extensive use as a prefix. Thus in Saxon *foreseon* to foresee, is in German *vorsehen*. The identity of these words will not be questioned. But in German as in Dutch the preposition *ver*, which is the English *far*, and Saxon *fyr*, is used in composition, in words in which the Saxon and English have *for*. Thus *forgifun*, to forgive, is in German *vergeben*, and in Dutch *vergeven*—Saxon, *forgitan*, to forget; German *vergessen*; Dutch *vergeten*. Hence we see that the Saxon *for*, *fore*, *fyr*, the English *for*, *fore*, *far*, and the German *für*, *vor*, and *ver*, are from the same radix.

In Dutch, *for* and *fore* are represented by *voor*, and *ver* represents *for* and *far*.

The Danish also unites *for* and *fore*, as does the Swedish.

The French has this word in *pour*, and the Spanish and Portuguese in *por*. The latter signifies not only *for*, but *through*, as in Portuguese, "Eu passarei *por* França," I will pass *through* France. Here we see the sense of moving. In Spanish and Portuguese this word is written also *para*, as if from the Greek. It is evidently the same word, probably received through a different channel from that of *por*. Now *through* is the exact sense of the Latin *per*; and *per* is the Italian preposition answering to *for* and *por*. But, what is more to the purpose, the Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese word, equivalent to the English *forgive*, is in Spanish *perdonar*; in Italian *perdonare*, and in Portuguese *perdonar*; and the French is *pardonner*. Here then we have strong, if not conclusive evidence, that *for*, *pour*, *por*, *per*, *par*, and *para*, in different languages, are all from one stock, the word being varied in dialect, or by the different families; just as we have *far*, as well as the Saxon *fyr*, and the English *forth*, *further*,

from the same primitive word. We have the same word in *pursue* and *purchase*, from the French *pour*.

The Greek has *παρα*, and *προς*, probably from the same root, as well as *περι*, *προς*.

Ge, in Gothic, which is *ge* in Saxon, is a prefix of very extensive use. In Saxon, it is prefixed to a large portion of all the verbs in the language. According to Iye, it has sometimes the sense of the Latin *cum*; but in most words we cannot discern any effect of this prefix on the signification of the simple verb. It is retained in the Danish and in some German and Dutch words, especially in the participles of verbs, and in nouns formed from them. But it is remarkable that although the Saxon is our mother tongue, we have not remaining in the language a single instance of this prefix, with the original orthography. The only remains of it are in the contraction *a*, as in *awake*, *adrift*, *ashamed*, &c. from *geawacan*, *ascēcan*; *gedrifan*, *adripan*; *geacēman*, *ascēman*. The letter *y* prefixed to verbs and participles used by Chaucer, as *yberied*, *yblent*, *ybore*, *ydyght*, and a few others, is the remnant of the *ge*. The words *yclad*, and *ycleped*, are the last English words used in which this letter appears.

It is possible that the first syllable of *govern*, from Latin *guberno*, Greek *κυβερνω*, may be the same prefix; or it may be the Welsh prefix *go*, which occurs in *goboru*, to work, which the Romans wrote *operor*. But we know not whether the first syllable of *govern* is a prefix or not.

There is another word which retains this prefix corrupted, or its equivalent; this is *common*, which we have received from the Latin *communis*. This word in the Teutonic dialects is, Saxon *gemene*; German *gemein*; Dutch *gemeen*; Danish *gemeen*; Swedish *gemen*. Now if this is the Latin *communis*, and of the identity of the last component part of the word, there can, we think, be no doubt; then the first part of the word is the Teutonic *ge* altered to *com*, or, what is more probable, *com* is the equivalent of *ge*, or *ge* may be a contracted and corrupted form of *cum*, *com*. In either case, we arrive at the conclusion that the Teutonic *ge*, and the Latin *cum*, are equivalent in signification.

In, is used in the Saxon and Gothic, as in modern English. It is in German *ein*, Dutch and Swedish *in*, Danish *ind*, Greek *εν*, Latin *in*, French *en*. This is radically the same word as *on* and *un*, the German *an*, Dutch *aan*, and Welsh *an*. In its original sense, it implies moving, advancing toward, and hence its use as a particle of negation or contrariety. "Eunt *in* urbem," They are going to the city. "Hæc audio *in* te dici," I hear these things said against you. In modern military usage, *on* is used in the same sense of advancing: "The army is marching *on* Liège."

Mid, in Saxon, signifies *with*. It is the Gothic *mith*, German *mit*, Dutch *mede* or *met*, and the Greek *μετα*; but not retained in English. It seems to have the same origin as *mid*, *middle*, *amidst*. In the Gothic it is used as a prefix.

Miss, a prefix, is the verb *miss*, to deviate. It is used in Saxon, German, Dutch, Swedish and Danish, in nearly the same sense as in English. Its radical sense is to depart or wander.

Of, is a preposition and prefix of extensive use in the Saxon, as in English. It denotes primarily, issuing, or proceeding from; hence separation, departure, and distance: in the latter sense, it is written *off*. It is the Latin *ab*, written by the early Romans *af*; the Greek *απο*, the German *ab*, the Dutch *af*; Danish and Swedish *af*. The Saxons often prefixed this word in cases where we use it after the verb as a modifier; as *of-drifun*, to drive off; as it is still used by the Germans, Dutch, Swedes and Danes. We retain it as a prefix, in *offset* and *off-spring*, Saxon *of-spring*. As it denotes *proceeding from*, it is the proper sign of the genitive case; the case expressing production.

Ofer, English *over*, Gothic *ufar*, German *über*, Dutch *over*, Danish *over*, Swedish *över*, is a preposition and prefix, in all the Teutonic and Gothic languages which we have examined; and in the same or similar senses. This seems to be the Greek *υπερ*, from which the Latins formed *super*, by converting the aspirate of the Greek vowel into *s*. This is probably the Heb. Ch. Syr. Ar. *על*, to pass, a passing, beyond.

On, is a Saxon preposition and prefix of very extensive use. It is obviously a different orthography of *in*, and it is used for

in the Saxon, as "*on onginn*," in the beginning. It has also the sense we now give to *on* and *upon*, with other modifications of signification.

In composition, *on* signifies *into*, or *toward*, as *on-blawan*, to blow in; *onclifian*, to adhere, to cleave to; and it is also a particle of negation, like *un*, as *onbindan*, to unbind. This *on* is only a different spelling of *un*, in Dutch *on*, German *un*, used as a word of negation. The Gothic has *un* and *und*, in the like sense, as the Danish has *un*; the Dutch *ont*. In this sense, *un* answers precisely to the Greek *οὐ*, and as this is sometimes written *und* in Gothic, as *in* is written *ind* in Danish, there can be little doubt that *in*, *on*, *un*, *οὐ*, are all from one stock. The original word may have been *han*, *hin*, or *hon*; such loss of the first letter is very common; and *inn*, from the Ch. and Heb. *הָיָה*, presents us with an example. See *In* and *Inn* in the Dictionary.

The German has *an*, and the Dutch *aan*, in the sense of *in* and *on*.

Oth, is a Saxon preposition and prefix, sometimes written *ath* and *ed*, and answering nearly to the Latin *ad* and *re*; as in *oth-wilan*, contracted, to twit, to throw in the teeth. It has also the sense of *from*, or *away*, or *against*, as in *othswe-rian*, to abjure. This preposition is obsolete, but we have the remains of it in *twit*, and perhaps in a few other words.

Sam, *samod*, a prefix. See the Danish and Swedish *infra*.

To, is a preposition and prefix of extensive use in our mother tongue. It occurs as a prefix in such words as, *to-læcan*, to break; *to-beran*, to bring or bear [*ad-ferre*]. We retain it in *together*, Saxon *togedere*; and in *toward*, Saxon *toward*, *to-wardes*; and in *tomorrow*, *today*, *tonight*. The Dutch write it *toe*, and the Germans *zu*, and both nations use it extensively as a prefix. In Gothic it is written *du*, as in *du-ginnan*, to gin, that is, to begin. It would be gratifying to learn whether the Ethiopic *†*, which is prefixed to many verbs, is not the remains of the same preposition.

Un, is a Saxon prefix of extensive use, as a privative or particle of negation. See *On* and *In*.

Under, is a Saxon preposition and prefix of considerable use, in the present English sense. The Germans write it *unter*, and the Dutch *onder*, and use it in like manner. The Danes and Swedes write it *under*, and use it in the same sense.

Up, *uppe*, is a Saxon preposition and prefix of considerable use, in the present English sense. The Gothic has *uf*, in the sense of the Latin *sub*. The Germans write it *auf* and the Dutch *op*, the Danes *op*, and the Swedes *up*, and all use it as a prefix.

Us, in Gothic, is a preposition and prefix. This is the German *aus*, and equivalent to the Latin *ex*. It is the Saxon *ut*, the English *out*, Dutch *uit*, Swedish *ut*, and Danish *ud*, dialectically varied. To this answers the Welsh *ys*, used in composition, but *ys* seems rather to be a change of the Latin *ex*, for the Latin *expello* is written in Welsh *yspeliaw*, and *extendo* is *estyn*.

Wither, in Saxon, from the root of *with*, denotes *against*, or *opposition*. It is a prefix in Saxon, written in German *wider*, in Dutch *weder*; Danish and Swedish *veder*. It is obsolete, but retained in the old law term *withernam*, a counter-taking or distress.

In the German language, there are some prepositions and prefixes not found in the Saxon; as,

Ent, denoting from, out, away.

Er, without, out or to. Danish *er*.

Nach, properly *nigh*, as in *nachbar*, neighbour; but its most common signification in composition is *after*; as in *nachgehen*, to go after. This sense is easily deducible from its primary sense, which is close, near, from urging, pressing, or following. In Dutch, this word is contracted to *na*, as in *nabuur*, neighbour; *nagaan*, to follow. The Russ has *na* also, a prefix of extensive use, and probably the same word. This fact suggests the question, whether the ancestors of these great families of men had not their residence in the same or an adjoining territory. It deserves also to be considered whether this *na*, is not the Shemitic *נ*, occurring as a prefix to verbs.

Wey, is a prefix used in the German and Dutch. It is the

Saxon, German, and Dutch *weg*, *way*; in the sense of *away*, or passing from, from the verb, in Saxon *wagan*, *wegan*, to carry, to weigh, English to *wag*, the sense of which is to move or pass; as German *wegfallen*, to fall off or away.

Zer, in German, denotes separation.

In the Gothic dialects, Danish and Swedish, *fra* is used as a prefix. This is the Scottish *fra* or *frae*, English *from*, of which it may be a contraction.

Fram in Swedish, and *frem* in Danish, is also a prefix. The primary sense is to go, or proceed, and hence it denotes moving to or toward, forth, &c. as in Danish, *fremfører*, to bring forth; *fremkalder*, to call for. But in Danish, *fremmed* is strange, foreign, and it is probable that the English *from* is from the same root, with a different application. It may be from the same stock as the Gothic *fram*, origin, beginning, Latin *primus*, signifying to shoot forth, to extend, to pass along.

Gien, *igien*, in Danish, and *igen*, in Swedish, is the English *gain* in *again*, *against*. This is a prefix in both these Gothic languages. It has the sense of the Latin *re*, as in *igienkommer*, to come back, to return; of *against*, as in *igienkalder*, to countermand, or recall; of *again*, as *gienbinder*, to bind again. This may be the Latin *con*.

Mod, in Danish, and *mot*, *emot*, in Swedish, is a preposition, signifying to, toward, against, contrary, for, by, upon, out, &c.; as "*mod staden*," toward the city; *modstrider*, to resist; *modgift*, an antidote; *modbör*, a contrary wind; *modvind*, the same. This is the English *meet*, in the Gothic orthography, *motyan*, to meet, whence to *moot*.

O, in Swedish, is a negative or privative prefix, as in *otidig*, immature, in English, *not tidy*. It is probably a contracted word.

Paa, in Danish, *på* in Swedish, is a preposition and prefix, signifying *on*, *in*, *upon*. Whether this is allied to *be*, *by*, and the Russ *po*, we shall not undertake to determine with confidence; but it probably is the same, or from the same source.

Samman, signifying together, and from the root of *assemble*, is a prefix of considerable use in both languages. It answers to the Saxon *sam*, *samod*, equivalent to the Latin *con* or *cum*. It seems to be allied to *same* and the Latin *similis*.

Til, both in Danish and Swedish, is a prefix, and in Danish, of very extensive use. It is equivalent to the English *to* or *toward*, and signifies also *at*, *in*, *on*, *by*, and *about*, and in composition often has the sense of *back* or *re*, as in *tilbage*, backward, that is, *to back*; but generally it retains the sense of *to* or *onward*; as in *tilbyder*, to offer, that is, to speak or order to; *tildriver*, to drive on; *tilgiwer*, to allow, to pardon, that is, to give to, and hence to give back, to remit. This is the English *till*, which we use in the same sense as the Danes, but in English it always refers to *time*, whereas in Danish and Swedish, it refers to *place*. Thus we cannot say, "We are going *till* town;" but we say, "Wait *till* I come, *till* my arrival;" literally, "Wait to I come, to my arrival;" that is, to the time of arrival. The difference is not in the sense of the preposition, but in its application.

The Scotch retain the Danish and Swedish use of this word; no slight evidence of their origin.

U, in Danish, the Swedish *O*, is a prefix, equivalent to *in*, and is used as a privative or negative; as in *uaar*, an unreasonable year; *uartig*, uncivil.

RUSSIAN.

Vo or *ve*, signifies *in*, *at*, *by*, and may possibly be from the same root as the English *be*, *by*. But see *po*.

Za, is a prefix signifying *for*, on account of, by reason of, after; as in *zaviduyu*, to envy, from *vid*, visage; *viju*, to see, Latin *video*; *zadirayu*, from *deru*, to tear; *zami-rayu*, to be astonished or stupefied, from the root of Latin *miror*, and Russian *mir*, peace; *miryu*, to pacify, to reconcile; *mirnie*, pacific; *zamirenje*, peace, pacification; *zami-rayu*, to make peace; Arm. *mirel*, to hold, to stop; the radical sense of wonder, astonishment, and of peace.

Ko, a preposition, signifying *to*, *toward*, *for*.

Na, a preposition and prefix, signifying *on*, *upon*, *at*, *for*, *to*, seems to be the German *nach*, Dutch *na*; as in *nagradu*, recompense; *na*, and the root of Latin *gratia*; *nasudayu*, to sit down, &c.

Nad, a preposition, signifying *above* or *upon*.
O, a preposition, signifying *of* or *from*, and *for*.
Ob, a preposition and prefix, signifying *to*, *on*, *against*, *about*;
 as *obnemayu*, to surround, to embrace; *ob* and Saxon *neman*,
 to take.

Of, is a preposition, signifying *from*, and it may be the
 English *out*.

Po, is a preposition and prefix of extensive use, signifying
in, *by*, *after*, *from*, &c. as *podayu*, to give to; *polagayu*, to
lay, to expend, employ, *lay out*; to tax or assess; to establish
 or fix; to believe or suppose; *po* and *lay*. This corresponds
 with English *by*, and the Latin has it in *posideo*, and a few
 other words. [Saxon *besittan*.] *Pomen*, remembrance, *po*
 and *mens*, mind.

Rad, a preposition, signifying *for*, or *for the love of*.

So, a preposition and prefix of extensive use, signifying
with, *of*, *from*; and as a mark of comparison, it answers nearly
 to the English *so* or *as*.

T, with the sound of *u*, is a preposition and prefix of exten-
 sive use. It signifies *near*, *by*, *at*, *with*, as *uberayu*, to put in
 order, to adjust, to cut, to reap, to mow, to dress, French
parer, Latin *paro*; *ugoda*, satisfaction; *ugodnei*, good, useful,
 English *good*; *udol*, a dale, from *dol*.

WELSH.

The prefixes in the Welsh language are numerous. The
 following are the principal.

Am, about, encompassing, Saxon *amb*, Greek *αμφι*.

An. See Saxon *In*.

Cy, *cyd*, *cyr*, *cym*, implying union, and answering to *cum*,
con and *co* in Latin. Indeed *cym*, written also *cyr*, seems to
 be the Latin *cum*, and *cy* may be a contraction of it, like *co* in
 Latin. *Ca* seems also to be a prefix, as in *caboli*, to polish,
 Latin *polio*.

Cyn, *cynl*, former, first, as if allied to *begin*.

Di, negative and privative.

Dia, negative and precise.

Dy, iterative

E and *ec*, adversative.

Ed and *eit*, denoting repetition, like *re*, Saxon *ed*, *oth*.

Es, separating, like Latin *ex*. See *ys*.

Go, extenuating, inchoative, approaching, going, denotes
 diminution or a less degree, like the Latin *sub*; as in *gobrid*,
 somewhat dear. This seems to be from the root of English *go*.

Han, expressive of origination.

Lled, partly, half.

Oll, all.

Rhag, before.

Rhy, over, excessive.

Tra, over, beyond. Latin *trans*.

Try, through.

Ym, mutual, reflective.

Ys, denoting from, out of, separation, proceeding from,
 answering to the Latin *ex*; as *yspeliau*, to expel. So *es*,
 Welsh *estyn*, to extend.

Most of these prepositions, when used as prefixes, are so
 distinct as to be known to be prefixes.

But in some instances, the original preposition is so obscured
 by a loss or change of letters, as not to be obvious nor indeed
 discoverable, without resorting to an ancient orthography.
 Thus without the aid of the Saxon orthography, we should
 probably not be able to detect the component parts of the
 English *twit*. But in Saxon it is written *edwitan* and *othwitan*;
 the preposition or prefix *oth*, with *witan*, to disallow, re-
 proach, or cast in the teeth.

It has been above suggested to be possible, that in the
 Shemitic languages, the *s* in trilateral roots, may be the same
 prefix as the Russian *na*, the Dutch *na*, and the German *nach*.
 Let the reader attend to the following words.

Hebrew *נבט*, to look, to behold, to regard. The primary
 sense of *look*, is, to reach, extend, or throw.

Ch., to look; also to *bud* or sprout.

Ar. *ناب* *nabata*, to spring, or issue as water; to flow out;
 to devise or strike out; to draw out.

If the first letter is a prefix, the Hebrew word would accord
 viii

with Latin *video*; the Chaldee, with *video* and with *bud*,
 Spanish *botar*, French *bouton*, *bouter*, to put, and English to
pout, and French *bout*, end, from shooting, extending.

Ar. *نبت* *nabatha*, to bud; to germinate. See Ch. *supra*.

Heb. *נפל* *naval*, to fall; to sink down; to wither; to fall
 off, as leaves and flowers; to act foolishly; to disgrace. Deri-
 vative, foolish; a fool; *נפל* *nafal*, Heb. Ch. Syr. Sam. to fall.
 Ch. *נפל* *nabal*, to make foul; to defile; that is, to throw
 or put on.

Ar. *نبل* *nabala*, to shoot, as an arrow; to drive as camels;

to excel; also to die, that is, probably, to fall.

Can there be any question, that *fall*, *foul*, and *fool* are this
 very word, without the first consonant? The Arabic without
 the first consonant agrees with Gr. *βαλλω*, and the sense of
falling then, is to throw one's self down.

Heb. *נצר* *natar*, to keep, guard, preserve, retain, observe.

Ch., to observe; to keep; to lay up.

Syr. and Sam. *id*.

Eth. *ነገር* *natar*, to shine.

Ar. *نظر* *natar*, to keep; to see; to look; to attend.

Remove the first letter, and this coincides with the Greek
τινω.

No person will doubt whether *נצל* *namal*, to circumcise, is
 formed on *נצל* *mul*.

Ch. *נצר* *nasar*, to cut; to saw. Syr. *id*. Lat. *serra*, *serro*.

Ar. *נחד* *nafida*, to fade, to vanish, to perish, to be empty,

to fail.

Heb. *נפח* *nafach*, to blow, to breathe. Ch. Syr. Eth. Ar.
id. from *נפה*, *fuch*, to blow.

If the Shemitic; in these and similar words is a prefix or
 the remains of a preposition, it coincides very closely with the
 Russ. and Dutch *na*, and the latter we know to be a contrac-
 tion of the German *nach*. Now the German *nach* is the
 English *nigh*; for no person can doubt the identity of the
 German *nachbar* and the English *neighbour*.

In the course of our investigations, we very early began to
 suspect that *b*, *f*, *p*, *c*, *g* and *k*, before *l* and *r*, are either
 casual letters, introduced by peculiar modes of pronunciation,
 or the remains of prepositions; most probably the latter. We
 had advanced far in the Dictionary, with increasing evidence
 of the truth of this conjecture, before we had received Owen's
 Dictionary of the Welsh language. An examination of this
 work has confirmed our suspicions, or rather changed them
 into certainty.

If we attend to the manner of articulating the letters, and
 the ease with which *bl*, *br*, *fl*, *fr*, *pl*, *pr*, *cl*, *cr*, *gl*, *gr* are
 pronounced, without an intervening vowel, even without a
 sheva, we shall not be surprised that a preposition or prefix,
 like *be*, *pe*, *pa*, *po*, or *ge*, should, in a rapid pronunciation, lose
 its vowel, and the consonant coalesce closely with the first
 letter of the principal word. Thus *blank*, *prank*, might
 naturally be formed from *belank*, *perank*. That these words
 are thus formed, we do not know; but there is nothing in the
 composition of the words to render it improbable. Certain it
 is, that a vast number of words are formed with these prefixes,
 on other words, or the first consonant is a mere adventitious
 addition; for they are used with or without the first consonant.
 Take the following examples:—

Hiberno-Celtic, or Irish, *brac* or *brach*, the arm, is written
 also *raig*, Welsh *braig*, whence *βραχιον*, brachium. *Braigh*,
 the neck, Sax. *hracca*, Eng. *rack*, Gr. *ῥαχίς*. *Fraoch*, heath,
 ling, *brake*, L. *erica*.

Welsh *llawr*, Basque *lurra*, Eng. *floor*.

Lat. *flocus*, Eng. *flock* or *lock*.

Sax. *hraccan*, Eng. *to reach*, in vomiting.*

Sax. *hracod*, Eng. *ragged*.

* *H* before *l* and *r* in Saxon corresponds to the Greek *ρ*, and Latin *c*,
 before the same letters.

Ger. *rock*, Eng. *frock*.
 Dutch *geluk*, Ger. *gluck*, Eng. *luck*.
 Greek, Eolic dialect, *βεδωρ*, for *βδωρ*, a rose.
 Latin *clunis*, Eng. *loin*, G. *tende*, W. *clun*, from *llun*.
 Eng. *cream*, Ger. *rahm*, Dutch *room*.
 Sax. *hlaf*, Polish *chlieb*, G. *leib*, Eng. *loaf*.
 Sax. *hladan*, Eng. to *lade* or *load*, Russ. *kladu*, to lay.
 Greek *κλινω*, Lat. *clino*, Sax. *hlinian*, *hleonan*, Russ. *klonyu*,
 Eng. to *lean*.
 Greek *λαγνος*, Lat. *lagena*, Eng. *flagon*.
 Sax. *hrysun*, Eng. to *rush*.
 French *frapper*, Eng. to *rap*.
 Sax. *geredian*, to make ready; in Chaucer, *greith*, to make
 ready. Sax. *hræd*, quick; *hradian*, to hasten; *hrædnes*, Eng.
readiness.

Spanish *frisar*, to curl or frizzle; *rizar*, the same.
 Sax. *gerefæ*, Eng. *reeve*, G. *graf*, D. *graaf*.
 Lat. *glycyrrhiza*, from the Greek; Eng. *liquorice*.
 But in no language have we such decisive evidence of the
 formation of words by prefixes, as in the Welsh.

Take the following instances, from a much greater number
 that might be produced, from Owen's Welsh Dictionary.

Blanc, a colt, from *llanc*.
Blith, milk, from *lith*.
Bliant, fine linen, from *lliant*.
Plad, a flat piece or *plate*, from *llad*.
Pled, a principle of extension, from *lled*.
Pledren, a bladder, from *pledry*, that distends, from *lled*.
Pleth, a braid, from *lleth*, Eng. *plait*.
Plicciaw, to pluck, from *llig*.
Ploc, a block, from *lloc*; *plociaw*, to block, to plug.
Phong, a plunge, from *llong*, our vulgar lunge.
Gloth, a glutton, from *lloth*.
Glas, a blue colour, verdancy, a green plat, whence Eng.
glass, from *llas*.
Glyd, gluten, glue, from *llyd*.
Claer, clear, from *llaer*.
Clav, sick, from *llav*.
C'wpa, a club, a knob, from *llwob*.
Clwt, a piece, a clout, from *llwod*, *llwet*.
Clamp, a mass, a lump.
Clawd, a thin board, from *llawod*.
Cledry, a board or shingle, whence *cledwry*, lattice, from
lled.

Bran, Eng. *bran*, from *rhan*; *rhanu*, to rend.
Brid, a breaking out, from *rhid*.
Broc, noise, tumult, a brock, from *rhoc*.
Broc, froth, foam, anger, *broci*, to chafe or fret, from *bruce*,
 a boiling or ferment, from *rhoc*, something rough, a grunt,
 Gr. *βρυχω*.

Bryd, what moves, impulse, mind, thought, from *rhdy*.
Brys, quickness, *brysiau*, to hasten, to shoot along, from
rhys, Eng. to *rush*, and *crysiau*, to hasten, from *rhys*, to *rush*.
 [Here is the same word *rhys*, with different prefixes, forming
brysiau and *crysiau*. Hence W. *brysg*, Eng. *brisk*.]

Graz, [pronounced *grath*,] a step, a degree, from *rhaz*, Lat.
gradus, *gradior*.

Grey, a cackling, from *rheg*.
Grem, a crashing, gnash, a murmur, *gremiau*, to crash or
 gnash, from *rhem*. Hence Lat. *fremo*, Gr. *βρυμω*.*

* We do not follow Owen to the last step of his analysis, as we are of
 opinion that, in making monosyllabic words to be compound, he often
 errs. For example, he supposes *broc*, a tumult, to be from *rhoc*,
 a broken or rough utterance; a grunt or groan; and this, to be a com-
 pound of *rh*, excess, what is over or beyond, and *oc*, a forcible utterance,
 a groan. We believe *rhoc* to be a primitive uncompound word,
 coinciding with the English *rough*.

Owen supposes *plad*, a flat thing, a *plate*, to be from *llad*, with *py*.
Llad he explains, what is given, a gift, good things, and *py*, what is
 inward or involved. We have no doubt that the first letter is a prefix in
plad, but beyond all question, *llad* is from the same root as *lled*, breadth,
 coinciding with Lat. *latus*; both from a common root signifying to
 extend. But we do not believe *llad* or *lled* to be compound words.

Dug, a duke, Owen supposes to be formed on *ug*, over; which cannot
 be true, unless the Latin *dux*, *duco*, are compounds. *Dur*, steel, he
 derives from *ur*, extreme, over; but doubtless it is from the root of the
 Latin *durus*.

So *par*, signifying what is contiguous, a state of readiness or prepara-
 tion, a pair, fellow, or match, Owen makes a compound of *py*, and *ar*;
py, as above explained, and *ar*, a word of various significations, on, upon,

We have some instances of similar words in our own
 language; such are *flag* and *lag*; *flap* and *lap*; *clump* and
lump.

There is another class of words which are probably formed
 with a prefix of a different kind. We refer to words in which
s precedes another consonant, as *scalp*, *skull*, *slip*, *slide*,
sluggish, *smoke*, *smooth*, *speed*, *spire*, *spin*, *stage*, *sleep*, *stem*,
swell, *spout*. We find that *tego*, to cover, in Latin, is in
 Greek *τεγω*; the Latin *fallo*, is in Greek *φαλλω*. We find
μαργαρος is written also *σμεργαρος*; and it may be inquired
 whether the English *spin*, is not from the same root as *σπινω*,
 web or woof, *σπινω*, a spindle, *σπινω*, to spin. *Spout* in
 English is in Spanish *brota*.

We find the Welsh *ysbrig*, the English *sprig*, is a compound
 of *ys*, a prefix denoting *issuing* or *proceeding* from, like the
 Lat. *ex*, and *brig*, top, summit.

Ygar, a separate part, a share; *ygar*, *ygaru*, to divide;
ygariao, to separate, is composed of *ys* and *car*, according to
 Owen; but the real root appears distinctly in the Gr. *καίω*.
 This is the English *shear*, *shire*.

Ygegiaw, to shake by laying hold of the throat, to shake
 roughly, is a compound of *ys* and *cegiaw*, to choke, from *ceg*,
 the mouth, an entrance, a choking. This may be the English
shake; Sax. *sceacan*.

Ygin, a robe made of skin; *ys* and *cin*, a spread or
 covering.

Ygodi, to shade; *ygaod*, a shade; *ys* and *cawd*.

Ysgrab, what is drawn up or puckered, a script; *ys* and *crab*,
 what shrinks. See Eng. *crab*, *crabbed*.

Ysgrawu, to scrape; *ys* and *craw*, claws, from *rha*.

Ysgrag, a scream, a shriek, *ysgregiau*, to shriek, from *creg*, a
 shriek, *cregian*, to shriek, from *creg*, *cryg*, hoarse, rough, from
rhig, rye, that is, rough; the grain so named from its rough-
 ness. This is the English *rough*, Lat. *raucius*. Here we have
 the whole process of formation, from the root of *rough*. We
 retain the Welsh *cregian*, to shriek, in our common word, to
creak, and with a formative prefix, we have *shriek*, and our
 vulgar *screak*. The Latin *riga*, a wrinkle, Eng. *rug*, *shrug*,
 are probably from the same source.

Ysgrivenu, to write, Lat. *scribo*, from *yagriv*, a writing,
 from *crip*, a mark cut, a row of notches; *criviao*, to cut, to
grave; from *rhie*, something that divides. Hence *scrivener*.

Ysgub, a sheaf or besom, *ysgubaw*, to sweep, Lat. *scopæ*,
 from *cub*, a collection, a heap, a cube.

Ysgud, something that whirls; *ysgudaw*, to whisk or *scud*;
 from *cud*, celerity, flight; *ysguth*, *ysguthaw*, the same.

Ysgoth, a push; *ysgothiau*, to push or thrust; from *goth*,
gothiau, the same; probably allied to Eng. *shoot*. The
 Welsh has *ygygythu*, to jet or spout, from the same root.

Yslac, slack, loose; *yslaciaw*, to slacken; from *llac*, loose,
slack, *llaciaw*, to slacken, from *llag*, slack, *sluggish*; allied to
 Eng. *lag* and *slow*.

Yslapiaw, to slap, to flap, from *yslab*, what is lengthened or
 distended, from *llab*, a flag, a strip, a stroke. *Llabi*, a tall,
 lank person, a stripling, a looby, a lubber, is from the same
 root; *llabiaw*, to slap.

Ysled, a sled, from *lled*, says Owen, which denotes breadth,
 but it is probably from the root of *slide*, a word probably from
 the same root as *lled*, that is, to extend, to stretch along.

Ysmot, a patch, a spot; *ysmotiau*, to spot, to dapple, from
mod, Eng. *mole*.

Ysmociaw, *ysmygu*, to mix with smoke, from *mcog*, smoke.
 So *smooth*, from Welsh *moeth*.

Yspail, *spoil*, from *pail*, farina, says Owen. We should say
 from the root of *palea*, straw, refuse, that is, from the root of
peel, to strip. *Yspeiliota*, to be pilfering.

surface, &c. But there can be no doubt that *par* is from the root of the
 Latin *paro*, to prepare, being the Latin *par*, equal; the root of a nume-
 rous family of words not only in the Japhetic languages of Europe, but
 in the Semic languages of Asia. It certainly is not a Welsh com-
 pound, nor is there the least evidence to induce a belief that it is not an
 uncompound word. Had the learned author of the Welsh Dictionary
 extended his researches to a variety of other languages, and compared
 the monosyllabic roots in them with each other, we think he would have
 formed a very different opinion as to their origin. We are very well
 convinced that many of the words which he supposes to be primitive or
 radical, are contractions, such as *rh*, *ll*, *ly*, the last consonant being
 lost.

Ypeliaw, to *xpel*, from *pel*, a *ball*, says Owen: but this is the Latin *xpello*, from *pello*. *Ball* may be from the same root.

Yspig, a *spike*, a *spine*; *yspigaw*, to *spike*; from *pig*, a sharp point, a *pike*. Hence Eng. *spigot*.

Yspin, a *spine*, from *pin*, *pen*.

Ysgynu, to *ascend*, Lat. *ascendo*, from *cyn*, first, chief, foremost. The radical sense is to shoot up.

Yslwç, a *slough*, from *llwç*, a collection of water, a *lake*.

Yspar, a *spear*, from *pdr*, a cause or principle of producing, the germ or seed of a thing, a *spear*. This consists of the same elements as *ber*, a spit, and Eng. *bar*, and in Italian *bar* is *sbarra*. The primary sense is to shoot, thrust, drive.

Yspine, a *finch*, from *pinc*, gay, fine, brisk; a sprig, a *finch*.

Ysplah, clear, bright; *ysplana*, to explain; from *plan*, that is parted off, a ray, a shoot, a planting, a *plane*; whence *plant*, a child; Eng. a *plant*; *planu*, to shoot, as a plant. Hence *splendour*, W. *ysplander*.

Ysporthi, to support, from *porth*, a bearing, a *port*, passage, &c. Lat. *porta*, *porto*.

Ystac, a *stack*, a heap; *ystacu*, a standard; from *tug*, a state of being stuffed or clogged.

Ystad, a *state*; *ystadu*, to *stay*; from *tad*, that spreads, a continuity. The primary sense is to set.

Ystain, that is spread; a *stain*; *tin*, Lat. *stannum*; *ystaen-iaw*, to spread over, to stain; *ystaenu*, to *tin*, or cover with *tin*; from *taen*, a spread, a layer. Qu. is *tin* from spreading?

Ystawi, a *stool*, from *tauw*, a cast or throw. The sense is to set, to throw down. *Tawl* is the root of *deal*.

Ystor, a *store*, that forms a bulk, from *tor*, a swell, a prominence.

Ystorm, a *storm*, from *torm*, that is stretched, but the sense is a rushing.

Ystrym, a *stream*, from *trym*, compact, *trim*, that is, stretched, straight, from extending.

Ystump, a *stump*, from *twmp*, a round mass, a *trump*.

Yswatiaw, to *squal*, from *yswad*, a throw, or falling down, from *gwad*, a denial; *gwadu*, to deny or disown. If this deduction is correct, the sense of denial is a throwing or thrusting back, a repelling. It is so in other words.

Yswitaw, to chirp, twitter, from *yswid*, that makes a quick turn. Qu. *twitter*.

In some of the foregoing words it appears evident that the Welsh prefix *ys*, is an alteration of the Latin *ex*, and the words in which this is the case, were probably borrowed from the Latin, while the Roman armies had possession of England. But there is a vast number of words, with this prefix, which are not of Latin origin; and whether *ys* is a native prefix in the Welsh, may be a question. One thing is certain, that *s* before another consonant, and coalescing with it, is, in a great number of words, a prefix.

The modern Italian affords abundant proof of the extensive use of *s*, as the remains or representative of *ex*; as *sballare*, to unpack, *unbale*; *sbarbato*, beardless; *sballere*, to abate; *sbrancare*, to pluck off branches; *scaricare*, to discharge; *scommodare*, to incommode; *sconcordia*, discord; *scornare*, to break the horns; *scrostare*, to pull off the crust; and a great number of others.

Now if the same manner of forming words with this prefix has actually prevailed among the northern nations of Europe, we may rationally suppose that many English words, and perhaps all of this class, are thus formed. Thus *scatter* may be formed from a root in *Cd*; *shape*, from *Cb*, *Cf*, or *Cp*; *skill*, from the root of Lat. *calleo*; *slip*, from the root of Lat. *labor*; *smart*, from the root of Lat. *amarus*, bitter, Heb. מָר; *smite*, from the root of Latin *mitto*; *span*, from the root of *pan*, to stretch; *spar*, from the root of *bar*; *speak*, from the root of Lat. *voco*; *speed*, from a root in *Pd*, perhaps Lat. *peto*; *steal*, from the root of Lat. *tollo*; *steep*, from the root of *deep*; *stretch*, from the root of *reach*; *sweep*, from the root of *wipe*; *swan*, from *van*, white; *swell*, from the root of to *well*, Sax. *wellan*, to boil, &c. That many English and other Teutonic and Gothic words are thus formed, appears to be certain.

These facts being admitted, let us examine a little further. In Russ. *swadiba*, is a wedding. Is not this formed on the root of *wed*, with *s* for a prefix? *Scara*, is a quarrel. Is not this formed on the root of *vary*, *variance*, or of *spur*? *Scerlo*,

is a borer; qu. *bore* and *veru*; *swertirayu*, to roll; qu. Lat. *verto*; *skora*, furs, peltry; qu. Fr. *cuir*; *skot*, a beast; qu. *cattle*; *skupayu*, to purchase in gross; qu. *cheap*, Dan. *kioben*, and its root; *slabei*, weak; qu. Lat. *labor*, *lapsus*; *slagayu*, to fold; qu. *lay*, and *plico*; *slirayu*, to pour out liquors; qu. Lat. *libo*; *slupayu*, to peel off bark or skin; qu. Lat. *liber*; *snimayu*, to take away; qu. Sax. *neman*, to take; *smoru*, new; qu. Lat. *novus*; *snig*, *snieg*, snow, Fr. *neige*. The Lat. *nivis* is from this root, with *g* opened to *v*. Russ. *spletayu*, to *plail*, &c.

The Russ. prefix *so*, occurs in a great number of words; *sobirayu*, to collect or assemble, precisely the Heb. and Ch. *בָּרַב*.

It now becomes an interesting question, to determine how far any analogy exists between the languages of the Japhetic and Shemitic families in regard to prefixes. For example, in the Shemitic languages, *ב* is a prefix of extensive use, corresponding almost exactly with the English and Dutch *by*, the Saxon *be*, and German *bei*. This preposition and prefix has several senses in the Saxon which are now obsolete; but its present prevailing sense occurs in all the Shemitic languages. *בְּרוּחַ עֵצִים*, *by* a strong east wind; Ex. xiv. 21. Compare the following definitions of this preposition; the Sax. from Lye, and the Shemitic from Castle.

Sax. *de*, *e*, *ex*, *in*, *secus*, *ad*, *juxta*, *secundum*, *pro*, *per*, *super*, *propter*, *circa*.

Heb. Ch. Syr. *in*, *e*, *ex*, *cum*, *propter*, *usque ad*, *adeo ut*, *ad*, *super*, *per*, *contra*, *ante*.

Eth. *en*, *per*, *propter*, *cum*, *secundum*, *apud*.

Ar. *in*, *cum*, *propter*, *per*, *ad*, *erga*.

In Numbers, xiv. 34, it signifies according to, or after; *בְּכִסְדֵּי הַיָּמִים*, according to the number of days. This signification is now perhaps obsolete in English, but was common in the Saxon; as, "*be his magnum*," according to his strength; *pro viribus suis*. So "*be tham mæstan*," by the most, is now expressed by, at the most.

Now it is remarkable that this word in Hebrew, Arabic, and Persic, is the preposition used in oaths, precisely as it is in English; Gen. xxii. 16, *בְּי*. *By myself* have I sworn. Arabic,

ballah or by *Allah*; Persic, *بِخُدا* *bechoda*, or *begoda*, by *God*,

the very words now used in English. The evidence, then, is decisive, that the Shemitic prefix *b* is the Teutonic *be*, *by*, *bei*, contracted, and this Teutonic word is certainly a contraction of *big*, which is used in the Saxon, especially in compound words, as in *bigspell*, [*by-spell*], a fable; *bigatandum*, to stand by. This prefix, then, was in universal use by the original stock of mankind, before the dispersion; and this word alone is demonstrative proof of the common origin of the Shemitic and Teutonic languages. Now it is equally certain that this is the prefix *b*, and probably *p*, before *l* and *r*, in *block*, *braid*, and a multitude of words in all the modern languages; and probably, the same letter is a prefix in many Shemitic words.

We know that *be* in the Saxon *bedelan*, and Dutch *bedeelen*, is a prefix, as the simple verb is found in all the Teutonic and Gothic languages. The Hebrew and Chaldee *בָּרַב* corresponds exactly in elements and in signification with the Saxon and Dutch. Whether the first letter is a prefix in the latter languages, let the reader judge. See the word *deal*, which, when traced, terminates in the Welsh *tawl*, a cast off, a throw; separation; *taolu*, to cast or throw off, to separate.

In Chaldee, *בָּדַר* *badur*, signifies to scatter, to disperse. The word has the same signification in the Syriac and Samaritan.

In Ethiopic, the word with *ለ* prefixed, signifies to wish, love, desire, and with *ተ* prefixed, to strive, to endeavour, and without a prefix, strife, course, race. Both these significations are from stretching, straining.

In Arabic, *بَدَرَ* *badara*, signifies generally to hasten, to run to; but *بَثَرَ* *bathara*, signifies to disperse, to sow or scatter seed.

This verb is written in Hebrew *בָּרַב* with precisely the same

signification. The Arabic also has the verb with this orthography signifying to sow, and also to beat or strike with a stick.

Now in Syriac ܕܪ *dar*, signifies to strive, or struggle. Here we have the simple verb, *without* the prefix, with the sense of the Ethiopic, *with* a prefix. Supra.

We find also the Arabic ٓثر *tharra*, the simple verb, signifies to sprinkle.

We find in Chaldee ܕܪܐ and ܕܪ the simple verb, sig-

nifies to disperse; in Syriac, the same. In Arabic ٓثر *tharau*, signifies to sow, like the foregoing verb, and hence to procreate. Both this and the former verb signify also to whiten, as the hair of the head, as we say, to *sprinkle* with gray hairs. The

Arabic ٓدر *dara*, signifies to drive, to impel, to repel, to contend, to strive; to shine, to sparkle. And here we have the literal signification of this whole class of verbs; to drive, urge, throw, send; hence to scatter, to strive, to shoot as rays of light, procreate, &c.

The Hebrew corresponding verb is ִדַּר or ִדַּר to scatter, to sow; and the word with the like orthography occurs in Ch. Syr. and Ar. This is the Latin *sero*. And who can doubt that ܕ is a prefix in the verb ܕܪ above mentioned?

In Welsh, *goberu* signifies to work, to operate; *gober*, work, operation; formed by the prefix *go* and *per*; *go* denoting progress toward, approach, and *per* rendered by Owen, that pervades, a fruit, a pear; but the real sense is to strain, to bring forth, to drive, thrust, urge, &c.

This word, in the Armorican dialect, is written either *gober* or *ober*; in Latin *operator*, whence Eng. *operate*. The same word is in the Ethiopic, ገበየ *gaber*, to make, to do; ገበየ *agabar*, to cause to be made; ገበየ *tagabar*, to work, operate, negotiate; ገበየ *gabar*, a maker.

This is the Heb. and Ch. ܕܪ to be strong, to prevail, to establish, and as a noun, a man; Ar. ܕܪ *jabara*, to make strong, to heal, as, a broken bone; to strengthen.

That this Shemitic word and the Welsh and Ethiopic are all radically one, there cannot be a question; and the Welsh proves indisputably that *go* is a prefix. This, then, is a word formed on ܕܪ or ܕܪ. The Heb. ܕܪ strong, that is, strained, and ܕܪ a wing, that is, a shoot, are from the same root, and

in Arabic ٓبر *abara*, signifies to prick, to sting, and its derivatives, the extremity of a thing, a point, a needle, corresponding with the Welsh *bar*, a summit, a tuft, a branch, a *bar*, and the Welsh *ber*, a pike, a lance, a spit, a *spear*, Lat. *veru*; in Welsh, also, *pâr*, a spear, and *per*, a spit, are all doubtless of the same origin.

In Syriac, ܕܪ *tsabar*, signifies to make, to work or operate. Is this the same root with a different prefix?

The same word in Arabic, ٓبر *tsabara*, signifies to be patient, to bear, to sustain.

We observe, that in the Teutonic and Gothic languages, the same word is used with different prefixes. Thus in our mother tongue, *begin* is written *gynnan*, the simple radical word, and *agynnan*, *beginnan*, and *ongynnan*; and in the Gothic, *duġinnan*, which, in English, would be *togin*.

Should it appear upon investigation, that verbs in the Assyrian languages have the same prefixes which occur in the European languages, the fact will evidence more affinity between the languages of these two stocks than has yet been known to exist.

Let us now attend to the natural causes which may be supposed to have obscured or destroyed the identity or resemblance of languages which had a common origin.

The affinity of words, in two or more different languages, is known by identity of letters and identity of signification; or

by letters of the same organ, and a signification obviously deducible from the same sense. Letters of the same organ, as for example, *b, f, p* and *v*, are so easily converted, the one into the other, and the change is so frequent, that this circumstance seldom occasions much obscurity. The changes of signification occasion more difficulty, not so much by necessity, as because this branch of philology is less understood.

1. CHANGE OF CONSONANTS WHICH REPRESENT THE ARTICULATIONS OF THE ORGANS OF SPEECH.

Consonants are the stamina of words. They are convertible and frequently converted into their cognates. The English word *bear*, represents the Latin *fero* and *pario*, and *fero* is the Greek *φωω*. The Latin *ventus* is *wind* in English; and *habeo* is *have*. The Latin *dens*, in Dutch, Danish and Swedish is *tand*; and *dance* in English is in German *tanz*.

These changes are too familiar to require a multiplication of examples. But there are others less common and obvious, which are yet equally certain. Thus in the Gaelic or Hiberno-Celtic, *m* and *mb* are convertible with *v*; and in Welsh *m* and *v* are changed, even in different cases of the same word. Thus in Irish the name of the hand is written either *lamh* or *lav*, and in Welsh *maen*, a stone, is written also *caen*. The Greek *β* is always pronounced as the English *v*, as *βουλόμεν*, Lat. *volo*, English *will*, German *wollen*; and the sound of *β* the Greeks express by *μβ*.

In the Chaldee and Hebrew, one remarkable distinction is the use of a dental letter in the former, where the latter has a sibilant. As ܕܪ *cuth* in Chaldee, is ܕܪ *cush* in Hebrew; ܕܪ *gold* in Chaldaic, is ܕܪ *gold* in Hebrew. The like change appears in the modern languages; for *water*, which in most of the northern languages is written with a dental, is in German written *wasser*; and the Latin *dens*, W. *dant*, Dutch *tand*, Swedish and Danish *tand*, is in German *zahn*. The like change is frequent in the Greek and Latin. *φρασσα*, in one dialect, is *φρασσα*, in another; and the Latins often changed *t* of the indicative present, or infinitive, into *s* in the preterit and participle, as *mitto*, *mittere*, *missi*, *missus*.

L and *r*, though not considered as letters of the same organ, are really such and changed the one into the other. Thus the Spaniards write *blandir* for *brandish*, and *escorta* for *escort*. The Portuguese write *brando* for *bland*, and *branquear*, to whiten, for *blanch*. The Greek has *φραγγελλιον* for the Latin *flagellum*. In Europe, however, this change seems to be limited chiefly to two or three nations on the coast of the Mediterranean. *L* is sometimes commutable with *d*.

We have a few instances of the change of *g* or *gh* into *f*. Thus *rough* is pronounced *ruf*, and *trough*, *trauf*.

The Russian often change the *d* of a noun into the sound of *j*, or the compound *g*, in the verb formed from that noun; as *lad*, accord, harmony; *laju*, to accord or agree; *bred*, damage, loss; *breju*, to injure.

The Italians and French have also changed a dental into a palatal letter, in many words; as Italian *raggio*, a ray, from Lat. *radius*; and *ragione*, reason, from *ratio*; Fr. *manger*, to eat, from Lat. *mando*, or *manduco*.

In the south of Europe, the Greek *χ* has been changed, in some instances, into the Italian or Spanish *z*, and then by the French into *s*. It seems that the Spanish *z* has, at some former period, been pronounced as a guttural. Thus the Gr. *βραχιον*, Lat. *brachium*, the arm, is in Spanish *braco*, and the Spaniards have the word from the Latin, or from the same source as the Latin and Greek, the Celtic *braic*. This word, *brazo*, the French changed into *bras*, and from that we have *brace* and *embrace*. A similar change occurs in *Durazzo*, from *Dyrrachium*, and in the Spanish *luz*, light.

The Teutonic nations often used *h* to express the power of the Greek *κ*, and the Latin *c*, as *heart* for *καρδια*, *horn* for *cornu*. Hence we find that the Saxon *hlinian*, *hleonian* or *hlynian*, to lean, is the Greek *κλινω*, Latin *clino*. The letter *h* is now dropped, and we write the worn *lean*.

In like manner, the Saxon *hlid*, which we now write *lid*, is from the same root as the Latin *claudo*, *cludo*, the Greek *κλειω*, which is contracted into *κλειω*. And in this word we may notice another fact, that the word signifies not only to shut, but to praise or celebrate, proving that this word and the

Latin *plaudo*, are the same, with different prefixes, as *laudo*, and that the primary sense is to *strain*. This in Saxon appears in *hlud*, loud, *hlydan*, to cry out.

In Latin, *f* and *h* have been converted, as *hordeum* for *fordeum*; and the Spaniards now write *h* for *f*, as *hacer* for the Latin *facere*; *hilo* for *filum*; *herir* for *ferrere*, &c.

The letters *r* and *s* are commutable. Thus *iron* in German is *eisen*; in D. *yzer*.

The letters *n* and *s* seem also to be commutable; as in Latin *pono*, *posui*.

The letters *l* and *r* are convertible; for the English *colonel* is in Spanish and Portuguese *coronel*, and in Armoric *coronal*.

The cause of these differences is in the position of the organs in the articulations; the position being nearly but not exactly the same.

2. CHANGE OF VOWELS.

The change of vowels is so common, as to occasion no difficulty in determining the sameness of words; indeed little or no regard is to be had to them, in ascertaining the origin and affinity of languages. In this opinion we accord with almost all writers on this subject; but we have to combat the opinion of that elegant scholar, Sir William Jones, who protests against the licentiousness of etymologists, not only in transposing letters, but in *totally disregarding the vowels*, and who seems to admit the common origin of words only when written with the same letters, and used in a sense precisely the same.*

We are not at all surprised at the common prejudice existing against etymology. As the subject has been treated, it is justly liable to all the objections urged against it. But it is obvious that Sir W. Jones had given very little attention to the subject, and that some of its most common and obvious principles had escaped his observation. His opinion with regard to both articulations and vowels is unequivocally erroneous, as will appear from the following list of words, taken from modern languages, and respecting the identity of which, that gentleman himself, if living, could not have the slightest doubt.

English.	Saxon.	Dutch.	German.	Swedish.	Latin.
draw, } drag, }		dragan,	trekken,	tragen,	draga, traho,
give,		gifan,	geeven,	geben,	gifva.
foot, } feet, }		fot, fet,	voet,	fuss,	fot, pes, Gr. πους.
book,		hoc,	haak,	hakeu,	hake,
day,		dag, dæg,	daag,	tag,	dag,
have,		habban,	hebben,	haben,	hafva, habeo.
		[Fr. avoir; ai, as, a, avons, avez, ont.]			
leap,		hleapan,	loopen,	laufen,	löpa.
burn,		byrnan,	branden,	brennen,	brinna.
will,		willan,	willen,	woollen,	willja, volo, velle.
stone,		stan,	steen,	stein,	sten.
broad,		bred,	breed,	breit,	bred.
earth,		eorth,	aarde,	erde,	jord, Dan. iord.
who,		hwa,	wie,	ho,	ho, Dan. hvo.
seek,		secan,	zoeken,	söken,	sequor.
bean,		bean,	boon,	bohne,	böna, Dan. bunc.

Here are scarcely two words written with the same letters in two languages; and yet no man ever called in question their identity, on account of the difference of orthography. The diversity is equally great in almost all other words of the same original. So in the same words we often find the vowel changed, as in the Lat. *facio*, *fecti*, *ago*, *egi*; *sto*, *steti*; *volo*, *vulsi*. Nothing is more certain than that the Welsh *gwey*, and the English *wood*, are the same word, although there is one letter only common to them both. It is pronounced *gooyth*, that is, *g* and *wyth*; as *guard* for *ward*. This prefixing of *g* to words which in English begin with *w*, is very common in Spanish and French. The word *war* in French is *guerre*; Sp. *guerra*.

3. CHANGE OR LOSS OF RADICAL LETTERS.

There are some words, which, in certain languages, have suffered a change of a radical letter; while in others it is

wholly lost. For example, *word*, in Danish and Swedish is *ord*; *wort*, a plant, is *urt*; the Saxon *gear*, or *ger*, English

year, in Danish is *aar*, in Swedish is *ar*, in Dutch *jaar*, and in German *jahr*.

In the word *yoke*, and its affinities, we have a clear and decisive example of changes in orthography. *Yoke*, the Latin *jugum*, is from the Chaldaee, Syriac, and Arabic יוֹג *yug*, to join, to couple; a word not found in the Hebrew. The Greeks retained the original letters in ζυγος, ζυγαι; the Latins changed the first letter to *j* in *jugum*, and inserted a casual *n* in *jungo*. From the Latin the Italians formed *giogo*, a yoke, and *giugnere*, to join; the Spaniards, *yugo*, a yoke, and *juntar*, to join; the French, *joug*, a yoke, and *joindre*, to join. In Saxon, *yoke* is *geoc* or *ioc*; in Dutch, *juk*; G. *joch*; Sw. *ok*.

One of the most general changes that words have undergone, is the entire loss of the palatal letter *g*, when it is radical and final in verbs, or the opening of that articulation to a vowel or diphthong. We have examples in the English *bow*, from Saxon *bugan*, to bend; *buy*, from *bycgan*; *brow*, from *breg*; *lay*, from *legan*, or *leggan*; *say*, from *segan*; *fair*, from *fæger*; *flail*, from the German *fliegel*, Lat. *flagellum*; French *nier*, from Lat. *nego*, *negare*.

The same or similar changes have taken place in all the modern languages of which we have any knowledge.

The loss and changes of radical letters in many Greek verbs deserve particular notice. We find in the Lexicons, *πραγμα*, *πραγος*, *πρακτικος*, are referred to *πρασσω* *πραττω*, as the theme or root; *ταγμα*, to *τασσω*; *ῥητωρ*, to *ῥιμι*; and *φραγμα*, to *φρασσω*. This reference, so far as it operates as a direction to the student where to find the verb to which the word belongs, and its explanation, is useful and necessary. But if the student supposes that these words are formed from the theme, so called, or the first person of the indicative mood, present tense, he is deceived. We are confident no example can be found, in any language, of the palatals *γ* and *κ*, formed from the dentals and sibilants *τ* and *σ*, nor is *ῥητωρ*, or any similar word, formed by the addition of the dental to a verb ending in a vowel. The truth is, the last radical in *ῥιμι* is lost, in the indicative mood; and in *πρασσω*, *πραττω*, it is changed. The radical lost in *ῥιμι* is *δ* or *θ*; the original word was *ῥιδω* or *ῥιδω*, and the derivatives *ῥητωρ*, *ῥητορικη*, were formed before the radical letter was dropped in the verb. No sooner is the verb restored to its primitive form, than we recognize its connection with the Irish *raidham*, to speak; Saxon *ræd*, speech; *rædan*, to read; German *reden*, *rede*; Dutch *raad*, &c.

The original root of *πρασσω*, was *πραγος*, *πρακμος*, or *πρακω*, and from this were formed *πραγμα*, *πρακτικος*, before the last radical was changed. No sooner is the original orthography restored, than we see this to be the Teutonic verb, German *brauchen*, Dutch *gebruiken*, Danish *bruger*, Sw. *bruka*, Sax. *brucan*, to use, to practice, and hence the English *broker*.

The same remarks are applicable to *ταγμα* and *τασσω*; *φραγμα* and *φρασσω*; *αλλαγη* and *αλλασσω*; *χαρκτηρ* and *χαρσσω*, and many other words of like formation. In all these cases, the last radical letter is to be sought in the derivatives of the verb, and in one of the past tenses, particularly in an aorist. This fact affords no feeble evidence that in Greek, as in the Shemitic languages, the pretoric tense or an aorist, was the radix of the verb. *Κραζω*, in Greek, is to cry like a crow or rook; but the last radical is changed from *γ*, as in the second aorist it forms *κραγεις*. Now in Danish, *crow* is

krage, in Ger. *krähe*, in D. *kravi*, in Sw. *kraka*; a fact that demonstrates the last radical letter to be a palatal, which in English is opened to *o*, in *crow*.

But it is not in the Greek language only that we are to seek for the primitive radical letters, nor in what is now called the root of the verb, but in the derivatives. The fact is the same in the Latin and in the English. The Latin *fluctus* and *fluri*, cannot be deduced from *fluo*; but the orthography of these words proves demonstrably that the original root was *flugo* or *fluco*. So in English, *sight* cannot be deduced from *see*, for no example can be found of the letter *g* introduced to form the participles of verbs. *Sight*, in Saxon *gesicht*, D. *zigt*, G. *sicht*, Dan. *sigt*, Sw. *sicht*, is a participle; but the verb in the infinitive, in Saxon is *seon*, *geseon*, Ger. *sehen*, D. *zien*,

* Asiatic Researches, vol. iii. p. 483.

Dan. *seer*, Sw. *se*; in which no palatal letter is found, from which *g* or *ch* can be deduced. The truth then is, that the original verb was *segan*, or in Dutch *zegen*; the *g* being lost as it is in the French *nier*, from the Lat. *negō*.

In the change of letters in the Greek verbs before mentioned, the process seems to have been from *γ* or *κ* to *ξ*, and then to *σ* and *τ*; *πράγνυ*, *πράξω*, *πράσσω*, *πράττω*. This is certainly a process which is natural and common. The Latin *brachium* thus became in Spanish *brazo*, and then in French *bras*; and thus in the Italian, *Alexandria* has become *Alessandria*.

When the last radical of a Greek verb is a dental, it may not be certain whether the original letter was *δ*, or *θ* or *τ*. We find the Greek verb *σπασω* to draw, forms its derivatives with *σ*, *σπασμα*, *σπασis*; and this is probably the Armoric *spaza*, from which we have *spay*. So *φραζω*, *φρασis*, and *φραση*, are evidently of the same family. It is not improbable that the original letter might have a compound sound, or it might correspond nearly to the Arabic *ظ* or *ض*, or the English *dh* or *th*, or *ds*, so as easily to pass into *d* or into *s*.

It is equally clear that many Greek words have lost an initial consonant. The letter most generally lost is probably the Oriental *מ*, but obviously the palatals *γ* and *κ* have, in many instances, been dropped. There seems to be no question that the Greek *ολος* is the English *whole* and perhaps *all*. This in Welsh is *oll*, or *holl*, in Saxon *al* or *geall*; and this is undoubtedly the Shemitic *כָּל*. So the Greek *αλλουμ* is the Welsh *colli*, to lose; and *ιλιω* may be the English *coil*, Fr. *cueillir*.

In like manner the Greek has, in many words, lost a labial initial, answering to the English *b*, *f* or *v*. The Greek *ιδω* is undoubtedly the Latin *video*; *ιγεν* is from the same root as *work*; *ιδως* is from the root of *vid*, in the Latin *divido*, and

individuum, that is, separate, and from the Arabic *بَدَّ* *badda*, to separate.

In many instances, the Latin retained or restored the lost letter; thus *hamaxa*, for *ἡμαξα*; *harpago*, for *ἡρπαγμα*; *harmonia*, for *ἁρμονια*; *video*, for *ιδω*.

If the marks of breathing, called spiritus asper and spiritus lenis, now prefixed to Greek words, were intended to represent the letters lost, or to stand in the place of them, they answer this purpose very imperfectly. The spiritus asper may stand for a palatal or guttural letter, but it does not designate which letter; the *ι*, or the *υ*; much less does this or the other spiritus justly represent the labials, *b*, *f*, *v*, or *w*. Whenever the Latins wrote *h* in the place of the Greek spiritus, we may conclude that the original letter was *η* or a cognate letter; and we may conclude also that the *υ* in *video*, and in *divido*, *viduus*, *individuum*, stands for the original labial lost in *ιδω*, and *ιδυς*. But there are many words, we apprehend, in which the lost letter is unknown, and in which the loss cannot be recovered, by any marks prefixed to the words. We may well suppose that *hymnus* exhibits the correct written form of *ὑμνος*; but what is there in the Greek *ὑφν* to lead us to consider this word as the English *woof*, and *ὑφανω*, to be the same as *weave*? Both the Greek words have the spiritus asper.

What proportion of Greek words have been contracted by the loss of an initial or final consonant, cannot, we apprehend, be determined with any precision; at least, not in the present state of philological knowledge. It is probable the number of contracted words amounts to one-fourth of all the verbs, and it may be more.

Similar contractions have taken place in all other languages; a circumstance that embarrasses the philologist and lexicographer at every step of his researches; and which has led to innumerable mistakes in Etymology. We know that the

Swedish *ar*, and Danish *aar*, a year, have lost the articulation *g*, and that the English *y* in *year*, is the representative of *g*, as *f* is in the Dutch *jaar*, and German *jahr*: for the *g* is found in our mother tongue; and in a multitude of words, one language will supply the means of determining the real origin or true orthography, which cannot be ascertained by another. But doubtless many changes have taken place, of which the evidence

is uncertain: the chain which might conduct us to the original orthography being broken, and no means now remain of repairing the loss.

In no language has the rejection or change of consonants served so effectually to obscure the original words as in the French. So extensive have been the changes of orthography in that language, that had not the early lexicographers indicated the loss of letters by a mark, it would be impossible now to discover the original orthography, or to trace the connection of words with other languages, in a large portion of them. And it is with regret we observe the influence of the French practice of suppressing consonants, extending itself to other countries. It is owing to the most servile obsequiousness of nations, that *Basil* or *Basilea*, the elegant name of a town in Switzerland, has been corrupted to *Basle*, and pronounced most barbarously *Bale*. The Germans are pursuing a like course in suppressing the palatal letters; a most unfortunate circumstance for the strength of the language.

The Italians also have a disposition to reject letters when they interfere with their habits of pronunciation; and hence we see, in their language, *piano*, written for *plano*; *flore* for *fiore*; *faccio* for *fio*; a change that has removed a radical consonant, and thus obscured or rather destroyed the affinity between the Italian and the Latin words.

Another difference of writing and pronouncing has been produced by the change of a sibilant letter into an aspirate; or, *e converso*, by the change of an aspirate into a sibilant. No person doubts whether the Latin *super* is the Greek *ὑπερ*; or *ἱμαλος* is *similis*; or *ἄλς* is *sals*, *salt*. The latter in Welsh is *halen*, *hal*. So *hellyg*, a willow, in Welsh, is in Latin *salix*. The Greek *ἑπτα* is the Latin *septem*, English *seven*. This in

Persic is *هفت* *heft* or *haft*, which approaches the Greek *ἑπτα*. It has been commonly supposed, that in this case, the aspirate in Greek has been converted into an *s*. There are, however, strong reasons for believing that the change has been the reverse, and that *s* has been dropped, and its place supplied by an aspirate. The word *seven* is, beyond a question, the

Shemitic *שבע*, whence *שבת*, Eng. *sabbath*; and the Gaelic *sean*, old, whence Latia *sener*, in Welsh *hen*, seems

clearly to be the Ar. *سَنَّ* *sanna*, to be old. It is then clear that in these words *s* is radical. It is probable, however, that the aspirate, in some cases, has been changed into *s*.

It deserves to be noticed that the radix of a word is sometimes obscured, in Greek and Latin, by the loss or change of a radical letter in the nominative case. We find in Latin *nepos*, in the nominative, is *nepotis* in the genitive; *honos*, *honoris*, &c. In these changes, we suppose the letter restored in the oblique cases to be the true radical letter. Thus *adamant* has been deduced by our etymologists from the Greek *α* negative and *δαμω*, to subdue, on the supposition that the stone was named from its hardness. This is a good example of a great part of all etymological deductions; they are mere conjectures. It did not occur to the inquirer that *adamas*, in the nominative, becomes in the genitive *adamantis*; that *n* is radical, and that this word cannot be regularly deduced from the Greek verb. Any person, by looking into a Welsh dictionary, may see the original word.

In some words it is not easy to determine whether *n* before *d* is casual or radical. In such words as the Latin *fundo*, to pour, and *tundo*, to beat, there is reason to think the *n* is casual, for the preterite is formed without it, *fudi*, *tufudi*. But in other words *n* before *d* seems to be radical, and the *d* casual; as in *fundo*, *fundore*, to found. For this word coincides with the Irish *bun*, foundation, and with the Shemitic *בָּנָה* *banah*, to build. So the English *find* is in Swedish *finna*, and *in* is in Danish *ind*.

Another fact of considerable consequence, is the casual sound of *n* given to *g*, which produced the effect of doubling the *γ* in Greek, and of occasioning the insertion of *n* before *g* in the Latin, as also in the Teutonic and Gothic languages. Thus we see the *γ* is doubled in the Greek *αγγελλον*, and we know, in this case, how the change originated; for the

original word is in the Gaelic and Irish, *agalla*. So γ is prefixed to another palatal or guttural letter in $\alpha\gamma\chi\omega$ $\epsilon\gamma\chi\omega$, $\iota\gamma\gamma\iota\omega$.

A similar nasal sound of *g* probably introduced the *n* before *g* in *lingo*, to lick; *linguo*, to leave.

We may be confident, in all cases, that *n* is not radical, when it is dropped in the supine and participle, as in *licium*, *licius*, from *linguo*. When *n* is retained in the supine and participle, there may be more reason for doubt; but in this case, the question may often be determined by the corresponding word in another language, or by some other word evidently of the same family. Thus we can have little doubt that *lingo* and the English *lick* are the same word, or that the Lat. *lingua* and *ligula* are of one family.

This casual insertion of *n* in words of this class must be carefully noticed by the etymologist, or he will overlook the affinity of words which are evidently the same. We have many words in English which are written with *n* before a *g* or a *k*, when the ancient words in the Gothic and Teutonic languages, and some of them in the modern Danish and Swedish, are written without *n*. Thus *sink*, in Gothic is *sigcwan*; to think, is *thagkyan*. It is not improbable that the Gothic word was pronounced with the sound of *n* or *ng*, as in English. So also in *siguan*, to sing; *laggs*, long. In a few instances we find the Swedes and Danes have the word written

in both ways, as *tanka*, *tænker* and *tycka*, *tykker*, to think. But in general the Germans, Danes, Swedes, and Dutch write words of this sort with *ng*.

To show how important it is to know the true original orthography, we will mention one instance. In our mother tongue the word to *dye*, or colour, is written *deagan*; the elements or radical letters are *dg*. To determine whether this and the Latin *tingo* are the same words, we must first know whether *n* in *tingo* is radical or casual. This we cannot know with certainty, by the form of the word itself, for the *n* is carried through all the tenses and forms of the verb. But by looking into the Greek, we find the word written with γ , $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\iota\omega$; and this clearly proves the alliance of the word with *deagan*. See DYE in the Dictionary.

We have many English words, in which a *d* has been inserted before *g*, as in *badge*, *budge*, *lodge*, *pledge*, *wedge*. In all words, we believe, of this class, the *d* is casual, and the *g* following is the radical letter, as *pledge* from the French *pleige*; *wedge* from the Saxon *wæg*. The practice of inserting *d* in words of this sort seems to have originated in the necessity of some mode of preserving the English sound of *g*, which might otherwise be sounded as the French *g* before *e*. And it is for this reason we still retain and ought to retain *d* in *alledge*, *abridge*. In like manner the Teutonic *c* has been changed into the sound of *ch*, as Sax. *wacian*, *wacian*, to wake, to watch; Sax. *thac*, *thalch*.

There are some nations which, in many words, pronounce and write *g* before *u* or *w*; as in the French *guerre*, for *war*; *guede*, for *wood*; *guetter*, for *wait*; in Welsh, *gwol*, for *wall*; *gwain*, for *vain*; *gwared*, for *guard*, which in English is *ward*, Sp. *guarda*. In some instances, the *u* or *w* is dropped in modern writing, as in the French *garenne*, a *warren*; *garde*, for *guard*. This difference of orthography makes it difficult, in some cases, to ascertain the true radical letters.

CHANGE OF SIGNIFICATION.

Another cause of obscurity in the affinity of languages, and one that seems to have been mostly overlooked, is, the change of the primary sense of the radical verb. In most cases, this change consists in a slight deflection, or difference of application, which has obtained among different families of the same stock. In some cases, the literal sense is lost or obscured, and the figurative only is retained. The first object, in such cases, is to find the primary or literal sense, from which the various particular applications may be easily deduced. Thus, we find in Latin, *libeo*, *libet*, or *libeo*, *libet*, is rendered, to please, to like; *libens*, willing, glad, cheerful, pleased; *libenter*, *libenter*, willingly, gladly, readily. What is the primary sense, the visible or physical action, from which the idea of *willing* is taken? We find, either by knowing the radical sense of *willing*, *ready*, in other cases, or by the predominant sense of the

elements *lib*, as in Lat. *labor*, to slide, *liber*, free, &c., that the primary sense is to move, incline or advance toward an object, and hence the sense of willing, ready, prompt. Now this Latin word is the English *love*, German *lieben*, *liebe*. "Inbet me ire," I love to go; I am inclined to go; I go with cheerfulness; but the affinity between *love* and *libeo* has been obscured by a slight difference of application, among the Romans and the Teutonic nations.

Perhaps no person has suspected that the English words *heat*, *hate*, and *hast* in *behest*, are all radically the same word. But this is the fact. Sax. *hatian*, to heat, or be hot, and to hate; *hatan*, to heat and to call; *hatan*, to call, to order, to command; *ge-hatan* or *ge-hatan*, to grow warm, to promise, to vow; Gothic *gahaitan*, to call, to promise; Dutch *heeten*, to heat, to name, to call, bid or command; German *heitzen*, to heat; *heissen*, to call; *hitzen*, to heat, to hoist; Swedish *hetta*, to inflame, to provoke; Danish *heder*, to heat, to be called. *Behest*, we have from the German or Swedish dialect. *Heat* coincides with the Latin *astus* for *hastus*, which is written with *s*, like the German. *Hate* coincides with the Latin *odi*, *osus*, so written for *hodi*, *hosus*, and as the Teutonic *h* often represents the Latin *c*, as in *horn*, *cornu*, the Danish orthography, *heder*, coincides with the Latin *cito*, to call. Now what is the radical sense? Most obviously to stir, agitate, rouse, raise, implying a driving or impulse; and hence in Latin *estuo*, to be hot, and to rage or storm; hence to *excite*, and hence the sense of the Latin *cito*, quickly, from stirring, rousing to action. In this case *hated*, as well as *heat*, is violent excitement. We find also in the Saxon and Gothic the sense of vowing, that is, of driving out the voice, uttering, declaring, a sense allied to calling and commanding, and to this is allied the sense of the Latin *recito*, to recite.

In English, *befal* signifies to fall on, to happen to; in German, the same word, *befallen*, has the like signification. But in Saxon, *gefallan* signifies to fall, to rush on; while in German, *gefallen* signifies to please, that is, to suit, to come to one's mind, to be agreeable. The Danish *gefaldet* has the same signification as the German.

We find by the Saxon, that the English *reck*, to care, and *reckon*, and the Latin *rego*, to rule, are all the same word, varied in orthography and application. To find the primary sense of *reck*, to care, we are then to examine the various derivative senses. And we need go no further than to the Latin *rectus* and English *right*, the sense of which is *straight*, for this sense is derived from *straining*, *stretching*. *Care*, then, is a *straining of the mind*, a stretching toward an object, coinciding with the primary sense of *attention*. The primary sense of *reckon* is to strain out sounds, to speak, tell, relate; a sense now disused.

The Saxon *care*, *care*, *cærcian*, to care, to cark, is connected in origin with the Latin *carcer*, a prison; both from the sense of straining, whence holding or restraint.

To prove how the primary general sense of a word may ramify into different senses, by special appropriation of the word among separate families of men proceeding from the same stock, let us observe the different senses in which *leap* is used by the English, and by the nations on the continent. In English, to *leap* is simply to spring; as, to *leap* a yard; to *leap* over a fence. But on the continent it signifies to *run*. Now it will be seen that this word, as used by the Germans, can not always be translated by itself, that is, by the same word, into English. Take for illustration the following passage from Luther's Version of the Scriptures: 1 Sam. xvii. 17. "Nimm für deine brüder diese epha sangen, und diese zehen brod, und lauff in heer zu deinen brüdern;" "Take now for thy brethren an ephah of this parched corn, and these ten loaves, and leap to the camp of thy brethren." *Leap*, instead of *run*, is good German, but bad English.* There are two other words in this passage, of which a like remark may be made. The German *brod*, loaves, is our *bread*, which admits of no plural; and *sangen* is our *singed*, which we can not apply to parched corn.

So in some of the Teutonic languages, to *warpe* kittens or puppies, to *warpe* eggs, is correct language, though to our ears very odd; but this is only a particular application of the

* He walks, he leaps, he runs.—Conceper.

primary sense, to *throw*. We say to *lay* eggs, but to *lay* is to *throw* down.

By this comparison of the different uses and applications of a word, we are able, in most cases, to detect its original signification. And it is by this means, we apprehend, that we may arrive at a satisfactory explanation of the manner in which the same word came to have different and even opposite significations.

It is well known, for example, that the Hebrew word בֵּרַךְ *borak*, is rendered, in our version of the Scriptures, both to *bless* and to *curse*. The propriety of the latter rendering is controverted by Parkhurst, who labours to prove, that in Kings and in Job, where it is rendered to *curse*, it ought to be rendered to *bless*; and he cites, as authorities, the ancient versions. It is true that in 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13; and in Job i. 11, and ii. 5, the Seventy have rendered the word by *υλογειν*, to *bless*; and other ancient versions agree with the Septuagint. But let the word be rendered by *bless* in the following passages: "Put forth thy hand now, and touch his bone, and his flesh, and he will *bless* thee to thy face." "*Bless* God and die." How very absurd does such a translation appear! It shows the immense importance of understanding the true theory of language, and the primary sense of radical words. Let us then endeavour to discover, if possible, the source of the difficulty in the case here mentioned. To be enabled to arrive at the primary sense, let us examine the word in the several languages, first of the Shemitic, and then of the Japhetic stock.

Heb. בֵּרַךְ to *bless*; to salute, or wish a blessing to.

2. To curse; to blaspheme.

3. To couch or bend the knee, to kneel.

Deriv. A blessing, and the knee.

Chaldee, בֵּרַךְ to *bless*; to salute at meeting, and to bid farewell at parting.

2. To bend the knee.

3. To dig; to plow; to set slips of a vine or plant for propagation.—*Talm.* and *Rabbin*.

Deriv. The knee; a blessing; a cursing; a scion; the young of fowls.

Syriac, ܒܪܟܬܐ, to fall on the knees; to fall or bow down; Judg. v. 27.

2. To issue or proceed from; Matt. xv. 19.

3. To bless.

Samaritan, ܒܪܟܬܐ, to *bless*.

Ethiopic, ብርከ, to *bless*. Deriv. the knee.

Arabic, برك *baraka*, to bend the knee; to fall on the breast, as a camel.

2. To be firm, or fixed.

3. To rain violently; to pour forth rain, as the clouds. Gr. βρεχω.

4. To detract from; to traduce; to *reproach* or pursue with reproaches; to revile.

5. To bless; to pray for a blessing on; to prosper; to be blessed.

6. To hasten; to rush, as on an enemy; to assail.

Deriv. The breast; the basin of a fountain; a fishpond, or receptacle of water, as in Heb. and Ch.; also increase; abundance; constancy; splendour; a flash of light.

In the latter sense, usually from برك *baraka*. Heb. and Ch. ܒܪܟܬܐ *baraka*.

The Arabic word supplies us with the certain means of determining the radical sense; for among other significations, it has the sense of pouring forth rain; and this is precisely the Greek βρεχω. The primary sense then is to send, throw, or drive, in a transitive sense; or in an intransitive sense, to rush, to break forth.

To *bless* and to *curse* have the same radical sense, which is, to send or pour out words, to drive or to strain out the voice, precisely as in the Latin *appello*, from *pello*, whence *peal*, as of thunder or of a bell. The two senses spring from the appropriation of loud words to express particular acts. This depends on usage, like all other particular applications of one general signification. The sense in Scripture is to utter words

either in a good or bad sense; to bless, to salute; or to rail, to scold, to *reproach*; and this very word is probably the root of *reproach*, as it certainly is of the Latin *precor*, used, like the Shemitic word, in both senses, *praying* and *cursing*, or deprecating.* It is also the same word as the English *pray*, It. *pregare*, L. *precor*, the same as *preach*, D. *preeken*, W. *pregethu*. To the same family belong the Gr. βραχω, βρυχω, βρυχαμαι, to *bray*, to roar, to low, Lat. *rugio*. Here we see that *bray* is the same word, applied to the voice of the ass and to breaking in a mortar, and both are radically the same word as *break*.

The sense of kneeling, if radical, is to throw, and if from the noun, the sense of the noun is a throwing, a bending.

The Chaldee sense of digging, if radical, is from thrusting in an instrument, or *breaking* the ground; but perhaps it is a sense derived from the name of a shoot or scion, and in reality, to set a shoot, to plant.

The Syriac use of this word in Matt. xv. 19, is intransitive, to issue, to shoot, or break forth. So in Arabic, to rush on, to assault. The sense of firmness in Arabic is from setting, throwing down, as in kneeling; and hence the sense of breast, the fixed, firm part.

That this word has the sense both of blessing and of cursing, or reproaching, we have demonstrative evidence in the Welsh language. *Rhég*, in Welsh, is 𐌿𐌿 without the prefix. It signifies a sending out; utterance; a gift or present; a consigning; a ban, a curse or imprecation. *Rhegu*, to give; to consign; to curse. From *rhég* is formed *reg*, a greeting, or salutation, [the very Hebrew and Chaldee word,] *pregeth*, a sermon, and *pregethu*, to preach. Here we have not only the origin of *preach*, but another important fact, that *reg*, and of course 𐌿𐌿 is a compound word, composed of a prefix, *p* or *b*, and *rhég*. But this is not all; the Welsh *greg*, a cackling, *regar*, to cackle, is formed with the prefix *g* on this same *rhég*. [Dan. *krage*, a crow.]

In Welsh, *bregu* signifies to *break*; *brég*, a *breach*, a rupture. This Owen deduces from *bar*, but no doubt erroneously. It is from *rhég*, and there is some reason to think that *break* is from 𐌿𐌿, rather than from 𐌿𐌿, but probably both are from one radix, with different prefixes.

We observe one prominent sense of the Arabic برك *baraka*, is to rain violently; to pour forth water, as clouds. This is precisely the Greek βρεχω; a word found in all the Teutonic and Gothic languages, but written either with or without its prefix.

Saxon, *raegn* or *regn*, rain; *regnan*, to rain.

Dutch, *regen*, rain; *regenen*, *beregenen*, to rain upon.

German, *regen*, rain; *regnen*, to rain; *beregnen*, to rain on.

Swedish, *regna*, to rain.

Danish, *regn*, rain; *regner*, to rain.

Saxon, *racu*, rain; Cimbric, *reakia*, id.

Here we find that the English *rain*, is from the same root as the Welsh *rhég*, *rhegu*, and the Shemitic 𐌿𐌿.

Pursuing the inquiry further, we find that the Saxon *reccan*, or *reccan*, [W. *rhegu*,] signifies to speak, to tell, to relate, to reckon, the primary sense of which last is to speak or tell; also to rule, which shows this to be the Latin *rego*; also to care, which is the English *reck*. That this is the same word as *rain*, we know from the Danish, in which language *regner* signifies both to *rain* and to *reckon*, to tell, to count or compute. In the German, the words are written a little differently; *rechnen*, to reckon, and *regnen*, to rain. So in Dutch, *rekenen* and *regenen*; but this is a fact by no means uncommon.

Here we find that the English *reckon* and *reck*, and the Latin *rego*, are the same word. The primary sense is to strain, to reach, to stretch. Care, is a stretching of the mind, like attention, from the Latin *tendo*, and restraint is the radical sense of governing. Hence *rectus*, *right*, that is, straight, stretched.

Hence we find that *rain* and the Latin *regnum*, *reign*, are radically the same word.

Now in Saxon *racan*, or *reccan*, is the English *reach*, to stretch or extend, from the same root, and probably *reck*,

* "Improbis urget iratis precibus."—Horace.

Saxon *recan*, *reocan*, to fume or smoke; for this is to send off.

We might have mentioned before, that the Chaldee *ܒܝܪܐ* a scion or branch, is precisely the Celtic word for arm; Irish *braic*, or *raig*; Welsh *braig*; whence the Greek *βραχίον*, the Latin *brachium*, whence the Spanish *braso*, whence the French *bras*, whence the English *brace*. The arm is a shoot, a branch, and *branch* is from this root or one of the family, *n* being casual; *branch* for *brach*.

On this word let it be further observed, or on *ܒܝܪܐ* if radically different, are formed, with the prefix *s*, the German *sprechen*, to speak, *sprache*, speech; Dutch *spreken*, *spraak*;

Swedish *språka*, *språk*; Danish *sprog*, speech; and Swedish *spricka*, to break; Danish *sprekker*. The same word with *n* casual is seen in *spring*, the *breaking* or opening of the winter; and here we see the origin of the marine phrase, to *spring* a mast, Danish *springer*, to burst, crack or spring. This in Swedish is written without *n*, *spricka*, to break, burst, split; but a noun of this family has *n*, *springa*, a crack, and *spring*, a spring, a running.

Now let us attend to other Shemitic words consisting of cognate elements.

Chaldee, *ܦܪܟ* *frak*, to rub or scrape; to rub out or tread out, as grain from the ear or sheaf; Latin *frico*, *frio*.

2. To collect and bind, as sheaves; perhaps English, to *rake*.

3. To *break* or *break* down.

4. To question; to doubt. In Saxon and Gothic *frægan*, *fragan*, signifies to ask.

Deriv. Froward; perverse; Prov. ii. 12. So in English *refractory*.

This verb is not in the Hebrew; but there are two derivatives, one signifying the inner veil of the temple; so called probably from its use in *breaking*, that is, interrupting access, or separation, like *diaphragm* in English. The other derivative is rendered *rigour*, or cruelty; that which strains, oppresses, breaks down, or *rakes*, harasses.

With this verb coincides the Irish *bracaim*, to *break*, to harrow, that is, to *rake*.

Syr. *ܦܪܟ* to rub, so rendered, Luke vi. 1. Lat. *frico*.

A derivative signifies to comminute.

Deriv. Distortion; winding; twisting. *Let this be noted*.

Ar. *فرك* *fraka*, to rub, Lat. *frico*.

2. To hate, as a husband or wife; to be languid, or relaxed.

Deriv. Laxity; frangibility; friability.

Heb. *פָּרַק* to *break*, burst, or rend; to break off; to separate.

Deriv. A *breaking* or parting of a road.

Ch. *פָּרַק* to *break*.

2. To redeem, that is to free, separate or deliver.

3. To explain, as a doubtful question.

Deriv. One who ransoms or delivers; a rupture; the neck or its juncture; a joint of the gers, &c.; the ankle; the joint of a reed; a chapter or section of a book; explanation; exposition. *פָּרַק* a rupture, coinciding with the English *broke*.

Syr. *ܦܪܟ*, to redeem.

2. To depart; to remove; to separate.

Deriv. A recess, or withdrawing; separation; liberation; redemption; safety; vertebra.

Sam. The same as the Syriac verb.

Ar. *فارق* *faraka*, to separate; to divide; to withdraw; to disperse; [qu. Lat. *spargo*,] to lay open; to disclose; to cast out; to immerse.

Deriv. Separation; distinction; distance; interval; dispersion; aurora, as we say, the *break* of day; also, a garment reaching to the middle of the thigh, qu. *frock*; also *breech*.

We have placed these two words together, because we are convinced they are both of one family, or formed on the same radical word. The latter coincides exactly with the Latin *frango*, *fregi*, *fractum*, for *n* in *frango* is undoubtedly casual. Now in Welsh *bregu*, to *break*, would seem to be directly connected with *פָּרַק* yet doubtless *bregu* is the English *break*, the

German *brechen*, the Dutch *breeken*, &c. In truth, the three words *פָּרַק* *פָּרַק* and *פָּרַק* are probably all from one primitive root formed with different prefixes, or rather with the same prefix differently written; the different words bearing appropriate senses, among different tribes of men.

We observe in the Chaldee word the sense of questioning. Perhaps this may be the Gothic *fragan*, to ask, and if so, it coincides with the Latin *rogo*, the latter without the prefix. In the sense of *break*, we find, in the Greek, *φραγνυμι*, without a prefix.

Most of the significations of these verbs are too obvious to need illustration. But we find in the Syriac the sense of distortion, a sense which at first appears to be remote from that of *breaking* or *bursting asunder*. But this is probably the primary sense, to strain, to stretch, a sense we retain in the phrase, to *break* upon the wheel; and by dropping the prefix, we have the precise word in the verb, to *rack*.

Now if this is the genuine sense, we find it gives the English *wreck* and *wrack*, the Danish *vrag*, Sw. *vrak*, a wreck. In Saxon, *wracan*, *wrecan*, is the English *wreck*, that is, to drive, or throw on; *wrace*, is an exile, a *wretch*. In Dan. *vraeger*

signifies to reject; Sw. *vråka*, to throw away; all implying a driving force, and that *wreck* is connected with *break*, is probable for another reason, that the Latin *fractus*, *frango*, forms a constituent part of *nauffragium*, the English *shipwreck*, which in Danish is simply *vrag*.

Now if *straining*, *distortion*, is one of the senses of this

root, the English *wring*, *wrong*, Danish *vrang*, Sw. *vrång*, may be deduced from it, for undoubtedly *n* is not radical in these words. The Dutch has *wringen*, but the German drops the first letter and has *ringen*, both to twist or wind, and to *ring* or sound; the latter sense from straining or throwing, as in other cases. Without *n*, *wring* would be *wrig*, and *wrong*, *wrog*; *wrang*, *wrag*, Dan. *vrag*.

In Greek, *φραγος* is a blanket or coverlet, and connected with *φραγνυμι*, that is, a spread, from stretching, or throwing over.

We find also among the Chaldee derivatives the sense of a neck, and a joint. Now we find this word in Irish, *braigh*, the neck; in Greek, without the prefix, *παχυσ*, the spine of the back; Saxon, *hracca*; English, the *rack*, and, from the Greek, the *rickets*, from distortion.

Coinciding with the Greek *φραγνυμι* to break, we find in Welsh *rhugau*, to rend; and coinciding with *παχυσ*, a *rock*, a *crag*, Welsh *craig*, and connected with these, the Saxon *hracod*, English *ragged*, that is, broken; evidently the participle of a verb of this family.

Hence we find the senses of *distortion* and *breaking* connected in this root, in a great variety of instances.

The Shemitic *פָּרַק*, to lighten, to shine or flash, is one of this family. The sense is, to shoot or dart, to throw, as in all like cases. And under this root, the Arabic has the sense, to adorn, as a female; to make bright or shining; which gives the English *prank* and *prink*, D. *pragt*, G. *pracht*. *Prance* is of the same family, from leaping, starting, darting up.

In Greek *βραχυς*, short, stands in the Lexicons as a primary word or root. But this is from the root of *break*, which is lost in Greek, unless in *φραγνυμι*, without the prefix. From *βραχυς*, or the root of this word, the French language has *abreger*, to *abridge*; and what is less obvious, but equally certain, is, that from the same root the Latin has *brevis*, by sinking the palatal letter, as we do in *how*, from *bugan*, and in *lay*, from *legan*; so that *abridge* and *abbreviate*, *brief*, are from one root.

It should have been before mentioned that the Latin *refragor* signifies to resist, to strive against, to deny, whence *refractory*; a sense that demonstrates the primary sense to be, to strain, urge, press; and *refraction*, in *optics*, is a *breaking* of the direct course of rays of light by *turning* them; a sense coinciding with that of *distortion*.

We see then that one predominant sense of *break*, is, to strain, to distort. Let us now examine some of the biliteral roots in *rg* and *rk*, which, if *b* is a prefix, must be the primary elements of all the words above mentioned.

Ch. *רָגַג* *rag*, *ragag*, to desire, to long for. This is the Greek *αἰρω*, and English to *reach*; for desire is expressed by

reaching forward, stretching the mind toward the object. So in Latin *appeto* and *expeto*, from *peto*, to move toward. This coincides nearly with the Latin *rogo*, to ask, and the Goth. *fragnan*, Sax. *fragnan*.

Syr. ܐܢܝ, to desire; and with olaph prefixed, ܐܢܝܐ to desire, or long; also to wet, or moisten; also ܐܢܝܐ, to moisten—Latin *rigo*, *irrigo*, to irrigate.

Deriv. Tender, soft, fresh, from moisture or greenness. Qu. Lat. *recens*, a derivative.

Here *desire* and *irrigation* are both from one root; desire is a reaching forward, and irrigation is a spreading of water.

This root, in Hebrew ܐܢܝ, signifies to weave, or connect as in texture and net-work; but the primary sense is to stretch or strain.

In Arabic, the same verb ܐܢܝ signifies to emit an agreeable smell; to breathe fragrance; radically, to throw or send out; to eject; a mere modification of the same sense. This is the Latin *frago*, whence *fragrant*, with a prefix; but according exactly with the English *reek*.

ܐܢܝ in Ch. Heb. Syr. and Sam., signifies to prolong, to extend. In Ar. as in Heb. in Hiph. to delay, or retard; that is, to draw out in time.

ܐܢܝ in Heb. has been differently interpreted; indeed, it has been rendered by words of directly contrary signification. The more modern interpreters, says Castle, render it, to split, divide, separate, or break; the ancient interpreters rendered it, to stiffen, to make rigid or rough, to wrinkle or corrugate. Castle and Parkhurst, however, agree in rendering it, in some passages, to quiet, still, allay; Jer. xlvii. 6; 1. 34. In Job vii. 5, our translators have rendered it *broken*, "My skin is broken," [rough, or rigid.] In Jer. xxvi. 12, it is rendered by *divide*, "He divideth the sea by his power." In Vanderhooght's Bible it is in this place rendered by *commoveit*, he agitates the sea. The Seventy render it by ܐܢܝܐ, he stilled; and this is the sense which Parkhurst gives it.

In Isaiah li. 15, and Jer. xxxi. 35, it is rendered in our version by *divide*. "But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared."

In Vanderhooght's Bible it is rendered in Isaiah li. 15, "I am Jehovah thy God, qui commovens mare, ut perstrepat fluctus ejus." In Jer. xxxi. 35, "commovens mare, ut tumultuentur fluctus"—agitating or moving the sea, that the waves roar, or may roar. The passage in Isaiah is rendered by the Seventy, ܐܢܝܐ ܐܢܝܐ ܐܢܝܐ, ܐܢܝܐ ܐܢܝܐ ܐܢܝܐ, "agitating the sea, and causing its waves to roar and resound." In the French translation, the passage in Isaiah is, "qui fend la mer, et ses flots bruient;" [I] who divide the sea, and the waves roar. In Jeremiah the passage is, "qui agite la mer, et les flots en bruient;" who agitates the sea, and therefore the waves roar. In Italian, the passage in Isaiah is rendered, "che muovo il mare, e le sue onde romoreggiano." In Jeremiah, "che commuove il mare, onde le sue onde romoreggiano;" who moveth the sea, wherefore its waves roar, or become tumultuous.

These different renderings show the importance of understanding the literal or primary sense of words; for whatever may be the real sense in the passages above mentioned, it cannot be to *divide*. If we are to give to *vau* in the following word, its usual sense of *and*, it is difficult to make sense of the word ܐܢܝ, by translating it, *he stilleth*: *He stilleth the sea and its waves are tumultuous*, or *He stilleth the sea that the waves may roar or be agitated*! This will not answer. The more rational version would be, *He roughens the sea, and its waters roar*; or he drives, impels it into agitation. In Ethiopic, the same word signifies to coagulate, to freeze, to become rigid; and this is undoubtedly the Latin *rigo*, and with a prefix *frigo*, and this signification is perhaps allied to the Lat. *rugo*, to wrinkle; for as a general rule, the radical sense of wrinkle is to draw, as in *contract*, *contraho*, and this seems to be the sense of *rigo*. Both these words are allied to *rough*, which is from breaking or wrinkling. This sense would perhaps well suit the context in these two passages, as it would also that in Job vii. 5: My skin is *rough*.

Now in Arabic, the general signification of ܐܢܝ is to return, to repeat, to withdraw, which may be from drawing back; a different application of the original sense, to strain, stretch, or extend.

The root ܐܢܝ in Chaldee signifies to spit, and this is probably the Latin *ructo*, somewhat varied in application. The same verb in Arabic ܐܢܝ, *rauqa*, signifies to drive off, to reject; to

shoot or grow long, as teeth; to strain, purify, or make clear, as wine; precisely the English to *rack*; also to spread, and to pour out. Hebrew ܐܢܝ, to empty, to draw out, to attenuate or make thin; and as a noun, spittle; Syriac, to spit, to draw out, to attenuate; Samaritan, to pour out, to draw out, to extend; Ethiopic, to be fine, slender, or thin; Arabic, to be soft, tender, thin. The verb ܐܢܝ has a like signification, and is perhaps from the same original root; ܐܢܝ, Hebrew, to spread, stretch, extend. But, says Castle, all the ancient interpreters rendered the word, to ordain, establish, make firm; to strike, to beat, as plates of metal. But the sense is to stretch, to spread, and the beating is only the means of extending. Hence ܐܢܝ, the firmament, which agrees well with Lat. *regio*, an extent; in Hebrew, properly, an expanse. And to reconcile the ancient and modern interpretations of this word, let it be remembered that *strength* and *firmness* are usually or always from *stretching*, *tension*.

Now let us hear Ainsworth on the word *regio*. "Regio a *rego* quod priusquam provincie fierent, regiones sub regibus essent atque ab his regebantur." How much more natural is it to deduce *regio* from the primary sense of *rego*, which is to stretch, to strain, to extend! *Regio* is an extent, a word of indefinite signification.

In Chaldee and Arabic this verb signifies to mend, to repair, to make whole, from extending, spreading over, or making strong. See the root ܐܢܝ, infra.

We observe that ܐܢܝ and ܐܢܝ agree, in original signification, with the English *reach*, on the root of which, or some of its derivatives, was formed *stretch*. That ܐܢܝ, ܐܢܝ, and ܐܢܝ were formed on any of the foregoing biliteral roots, we may not be able to affirm; but it is certain from the Welsh, that the first consonant of the triliteral root is a prefix, and it is certain, from the Semitic languages, that the primary sense is the same in the biliteral and triliteral roots, or that all the applications or particular significations may readily be deduced from one general signification.

To illustrate this subject more fully, let us attend to the various applications of some other Semitic words of extensive use.

בָּרָא.

Heb. בָּרָא *bara*, to create. This, by most lexicographers, is given as the first signification in all the Semitic languages. Parkhurst says, to create; to produce into being; Gen. i. 1.

2. To form by accretion or concretion of matter; Gen. i. 21.

3. In Hiph. to make fat; to fatten or batten; 1 Sam. ii. 29.

4. To do or perform something wonderful; Num. xvi. 30.

5. In Niph. to be renewed. In Kal. to renew, in a spiritual sense; Ps. li. 12.

Castle says,

1. To create from nothing, or to produce something new or excellent from another thing; Gen. i; Is. xliii. 5.

2. In Niph. to be renewed or re-created; Is. xlviii. 7; Ps. cii. 19.

3. To cut off; to take away; to *bear* away, or remove; also to select; to prepare; Josh. xvii. 15, 18; Ezck. xxiii. 47.

Gesenius says,

1. Strictly, to hew, to hew out. [Ar. to cut, to cut out, to plane.]

2. To form; to make; to produce. Ar. ܐܢܝ. The order

of significations is, as in the Ar. ܐܢܝ *galaka*, to be smooth, to make smooth. 2. To plane. 3. To form, make; Gen. i. 1, 21, 27.

1. Niph. passive of Kal. No. 2; Gen. ii. 4.

2. To be born; Ezck. xxi. 30; Ps. cii. 18.

Pi. $\pi\alpha\beta$, the verb differently pointed; to hew, to cut down; Josh. xvii. 15, 18.

2. To cut down with the sword; to kill; Ezek. xxiii. 47.

3. To make fat; 1 Sam. ii. 29.

Thus far the Hebrew.

Chal. $\pi\alpha\beta$, to create; Gen. i. 1.

2. To cut off; Is. xl. 20.

3. To make fat; to grow sound or strong. Talm.

Deriv. Fat; whole; sound; strong. *Castle.*

Syr. $\pi\alpha\beta$, to create; Gen. i. 1; Mark xiii. 19.

2. To remove to a distance; and Deriv. distance, distant. *Castle.*

Sam. $\pi\alpha\beta$, to create; Gen. i. 22; Deut. iv. 32. *Castle.*

Ar. $\pi\alpha\beta$, to create; Job xxxviii. 7. [qu. 4 and 6.]

2. To be free, or guiltless, not obnoxious to punishment; Num. v. 28, 31; and xxii. 22; Rom. vii. 6.

3. To free; to absolve from a crime; to liberate; to dismiss; to justify; Ex. xx. 7; Num. xiv. 18.

4. To escape; to forsake.

5. To recover from disease; to be healed; to restore to health; Lev. xiii. 18; Josh. v. 8; Matt. iv. 23.

6. To cleanse; to free from impurities.

7. To abstain from.

Deriv. Creator; free; unobnoxious; clean; empty.

Ar. $\pi\alpha\beta$, to create.

2. To cut off; to hew or *pare*.

3. To separate; to distinguish.

4. To make thin.

5. To oppose; to strive; to resist.

6. To provoke; to boast, or make a parade.

7. To distribute; to disperse. *Castle.*

According to Gesenius, the primary sense of the verb is to *hew*, to *cut out*, and thus to make smooth, and thus to create; and he deduces these senses in the same order as he does those of the Arabic verb, which gives the word *like*. But there is no ground for this opinion; and doubtless the verb originated before the use of edge tools.

The predominant senses of this word are, to separate, to free, to remove; as we see by the Arabic and Syriac.

Now *hewing* is indeed separating, and we have the English word *pare* from this root; but we must seek for a signification which is more general than that of *paring*, or we shall not be able to account for the sense of making fat, sound, entire, and strong, nor for that of being born.

The truth undoubtedly is, this word is of the same family with the English *bear*, the Latin *pario*, and the radical sense is to *throw*, to *thrust*, to *send*, to *drive*, to *extend*; hence to throw out, to produce, as applied to the birth of children or of the world. To *throw* or *drive*, is the primary sense of separation and division, that is, to drive off. The English word *deal*, when traced to its root, presents the same fact. See *Deal*. To *create*, is to *produce* or *bring forth*, the same sense as that of *birth*, applied to a different object. The sense of *hewing* and *paring* is from driving off, separation. In Syriac, we observe the general application, in *removal*, or *departure* to a distance. The sense of fattening is derivative, and allied to that of healing or making whole, sound, strong, in the Arabic; that is, preparing, bringing to a good state, or from tension, the usual primary sense of strength and power.

To obtain a more full and satisfactory view of this subject, let us attend to the same word in the modern languages of Europe.

LATIN.

Paro, to prepare, make ready, procure, design, &c. The radical sense of *paro* is probably the same as in the Shemitic languages; to produce, to bring forward. So also *ready* implies an advancing, and so does *promptness*. But the various ways of preparing a thing for use naturally give to the word, in process of time, a variety of particular significations; each of which results in bringing the thing to the state desired.

The compounds of *paro*, are *apparo*, to prepare, to furnish, accoutre, or set out; *comparo*, to prepare or procure, to make equal, to compare, to join, to dress or make ready; *preparo*, to prepare; *reparo*, to repair, to create anew, to regain, to compensate; *separo*, to separate. Let the Latin uses of this word be compared with the same Hebrew word in Joshua xvii. 15, where it is rendered *cut down*. "Ascend to the wood country and cut down for thyself;" Septuagint, $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$, clear for thyself. This is one mode of preparation for use. In Ezek. xxi. 19, it is rendered choose; Septuagint, $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, appoint.

ITALIAN.

Parare, to prepare; to garnish; to adorn; to propose an occasion; to *parry*, or ward off, as a blow; to defend; to cover from or shelter; to repair; to teach a horse to stop, and in *horsemanship*, to stop; *parata*, a warding off, a garnishing; *parato*, prepared, ready, prompt, warded off or parried, shielded, defended.

Apparare, to learn; *apparato*, learned, prepared; *apparato*, preparation, garnishment.

Parecchio, a preparation; also equal, even [L. *par*.] *parecchiare*, to prepare; *pareggiare*, to make equal, to compare; *apparecchiare*, to prepare, to ornament or garnish, to set in order; *appareggiare*, to put in competition, to match, to equal.

Comparare, to compare.

Disparare, to forget; *disparare*, *sparare*, to unfurnish, disgaruish, to make unready, to disbowel, to separate, disjoin, unpair; to discharge, as artillery.

Imparare, to learn.

Riparare, to repair, to restore to the first state; to repair, or resort to, or have access to; to *parry*, or ward off; *riparo*, reparation, a fort, a bank, fence, mound, remedy, shelter.

SPANISH.

Parar, to prepare; to stop, detain, prevent; to end; to treat or use ill; to stake at cards; to point out the game, as pointers.

Parada, a halt or stopping, end, pause; a fold for cattle; a relay, as of horses; a dam or bank; a stake or bet; a *parade*, or a place where troops are assembled to exercise; *parado*, remiss, careless, unemployed.

Par, a pair; a peer; after-birth; the handle of a bell.

Aparar, to stretch out the hands or skirts of a garment for receiving any thing; to dig and heap earth round plants; to close the upper and hind quarter of a shoe to the sole; to couple male and female animals; to dub as a ship.

Aparador, a sideboard, a dresser in a kitchen, a workshop, a wardrobe; *aparato*, preparation, pomp, show.

Aparear, to match; to suit one thing to another [pair].

Aparejo, preparation, harness, sizing of a piece of linen or board on which something is to be painted, tackle, rigging employed on board of a ship. [*Apparel*, *parrel*.]

Comparar, to compare.

Disparajar, to make unequal.

Disparar, to discharge, as fire-arms.

Amparar, to shelter; to protect. [Aragon, to sequester, as goods.]

Emparedar, to confine or shut up.

Reparar, to repair; to observe carefully, to consider; to mend or correct; to suspend or detain; to guard, defend, protect; to regain strength, or recover from sickness; to right the helm.

Separar, to separate.

PORTUGUESE.

Parar, *v. i.* to stop, to cease to go forward; to confine upon, to meet at the end, to touch, to be bounded; to tend, to drive at something, to aim at, to come to; to imply, involve, or comprise: "Naõ posso parar com fome," I cannot *bear* hunger. "Ninguém pode aqui parar," Nobody can live or stay here. [Eng. *bear*.]

Parar, *v. t.* to stop, to hinder from proceeding; to *parry* or ward off; to turn or change with regard to inclination or morals; to lay or stake as a wager. *Parada*, a stopping or place of stopping; a bet or wager.

Amparar, to protect, shelter, defend, abet.

Comparar, to compare; *comprar*, to buy, to procure.
Aparar, to *pare*, as an apple; to mend or make a pen; to *parry* a blow.

Aparelhar, to prepare, to fit, to cut out or rough hew; *aparelho*, tackle in a ship for hoisting things, [Eng. a *parrel*.]
Disparar, to shoot, to discharge, as fire-arms.

Reparar, to repair; to *parry* in fencing; to advert; to observe; to make amends; to retrieve; to recover; to recruit; to shelter; *reparo*, in fortification, defence.

FRENCH.

Purer, to deck, adorn, trim, set off, embellish; to *parry* or ward off. "*Parer des cuirs*," to dress leather; "*Parer le pied d'un cheval*," to *pare* a horse's hoof.

Parer, v. i. to stop; *paresse*, idleness.

Pari, a lay, bet, or wager; *parier*, to bet or lay a wager.

Appareil, preparation, furniture, train, retinue, [Eng. *aparel*.]
Apparaux, tackle, sails, and rigging, [Eng. *parrel*.]

Pair, a peer, an equal; *paire*, a pair; *apparier*, to pair, to match.

S'emparer, to seize, to invade.

Reparer, to repair.

Separer, to separate.

ARMORIC.

Para, to dress, to trim, to stop, to *parry*, to prepare.

RUSSIAN.

Uberayn, to put in order, to adjust, to mow or reap, to cut, to dress, as the hair. This word has the common prefix *u*.

PERSIC.

پريدان *poridan*, to cut off.

WELSH.

Par, something contiguous, or that is in continuity; a state of readiness or preparedness; a *pair* or couple; a fellow, match.

Pâr, a cause; the essence, germ, or seed of a thing; a *spear*.

Para, to continue, to endure, to persevere.

Pwriad, a causing; *parai*, that causes to be.

Purawd, prepared, ready; *parodi*, to prepare.

That all the foregoing words in the present European languages, [and several others might have been added,] are formed from one stock or radix, coinciding with the Latin *pario*, is a fact that admits of no question. The only doubt respecting the correctness of the whole preceding statement, is, whether the Latin *pario* is radically the same as the Oriental *parâ*; and with regard to this point, we should suppose the evidence to be convincing. Indeed, there is good reason to believe that the Oriental verbs *parâ*, *pari*, and *pari* are all formed from one primitive radix. Certain it is that the English *bear* comprehends both the Latin *fero* and *pario*, and

the latter corresponds nearly with *פריד* and Eth. *ḥḥp fari*, to bear.

But admitting only what is certain, that all the foregoing European words are from one radix, we are then to seek for a primary meaning from which may be deduced the following significations; Lat. to *prepare*; Ital. to adorn, to *parry*, to stop, to defend, to *repair*, to learn; Span. to *prepare*, to stop, to lay or stake as a wager, a *pair* or couple; Port. to stop, to confine upon or be contiguous, to drive or aim at, to *parry*, to *pare*; Fr. to deck, to *parry*, to stop, to *pare*; Arm. to dress, to *prepare*, to *parry*; Russ. to adjust, to dress, to mow or reap; Welsh, *preparedness*, contiguity, a *pair*, a cause, to continue or endure; and several other significations.

The various significations result from throwing, sending, driving. To separate or remove, is to drive or force apart; hence to *parry*, and hence to defend. Separation implies extension, a drawing out in length or time; hence the Portuguese senses of confining upon, reaching to the limit. This

gives the sense of *par*, equal, that is, of the same extent, and hence coming to, and suiting, as in Latin *convenio*.

Here let it be observed, that admitting the word *par*, equal, to belong to this family, as in the Welsh, we have strong reason to believe that the Shemitic *parâ*, to join, or fit together, to associate, whence as a noun, an associate, is formed from the same root, or *parâ*; for in the Saxon we find not only *fera*, but *gefera*, a companion, fellow, or *peer*; *gefera*, answering precisely to the Oriental word.

The sense of betting is from throwing down, as we say, to *lay* a wager. The sense of stopping is from setting, fixing, or from *parrying*. The sense of adorning is from putting on, which is from sending, or from extension, enlargement, as we say, to *set off*, and hence it is allied to the sense of show, display, *parade*. Preparation is from producing, bringing forward, or adjusting, making right; and often implies advancing, like *ready*, *prompt*, and the latter word, *prompt*, from *promo*, to bring forth, affords a good illustration of the words derived from *pario*.

The senses of cutting off, *paring*, and the like, require no explanation.

The Italian *disparare*, and the Spanish and Portuguese *disparar*, to discharge fire-arms, present the original sense of the root, to send or drive. This sense gives that of the Welsh *pâr*, a spear, as well as a cause, or that which impels. A *spear* is a shoot, from the sense of thrusting; and our word *spear* is probably formed from the root of *bar*, and Welsh *ber*, a spit, a pike, a lance, a spear, Lat. *veru*. Now in Chaldee, a *bar* is *כבר*, from *כב*, to pass, a verb which is probably of the same family with *parâ*. It is further to be observed that in Italian, *bar* is written both *barra* and *sbarra*.

It is observed above that *parâ* is the English *bear* and the Latin *pario*; but *pario* would seem to be the Hebrew *פריד* *parâh*, to be fruitful, to bear fruit, applied to plants and animals. But this word seems to denote producing in general, rather than the production of children. However this may be, it is certain that *bear* in English, as well as in Saxon, expresses the sense of both *pario* and *fero* in Latin. The Latin *fero*, and the Greek *φίω*, signify both to carry and to produce, as young or fruit. *Pario*, does not. So in the Gothic, *bairan* is to carry, *gabairan* is to carry and to produce young. In German, *führen* is to carry, and *gebären*, to bring forth, to bear a child. In Dutch, *beuren* is to lift; *voeren*, to carry; and *baaren*, to bring forth, as children, to bear, to beget, to cause. Danish, *bærer*, to carry, to support, and to yield or

produce. Sw. *bära*, to carry; *barn*, a son. Irish *beirim*, to bear or bring forth, and to tell or relate, like the Latin *fero*, whence Fr. *parler*, to speak.

It appears then that the English *bear*, and the Saxon from which we have received it, and the Gothic and the Danish corresponding words unite, in the same orthography, the senses of two words of different orthography in other languages. We have found other examples of a similar kind. There is, therefore, solid ground to believe that all these words are from one primitive root; the different modes of writing the word, and the several appropriations, having originated in different families of the great races of men, before languages were reduced to writing; and when they came to be written, each word was written according to its usual pronunciation, and defined according to its use in each family. And by the intermixture of tribes, two or three derivatives of the same stock might have become a part of the same national language. Unquestionably the Greek *φίω*, and *φάω*, are branches of the same stock.

We have, in the modern languages, decisive evidence that different verbs may have, and in fact have a common radix. Thus in English *list* and *lust* are different modes of writing the same word; both are united in the other Teutonic dialects. So in Latin *libet* and *lubet*; and similar instances we have found in almost every language which we have examined.

The Latin *pareo*, to appear, to come to light, if not a compound word, may be of this family. *Paries*, a wall, if primarily a partition wall, is of the same stock. *Per* belongs to this family, as its signification is *passing*. The Sax. *faran*, to fare, Gr. *φορημα*, seems to be from one branch of this stock, probably *כבר*. See the word *Pass* in the Dictionary, in

the derivative senses of which there are some resemblances to those of כפר.

כפר *kafar*.

This verb, says Lowth, means to *cover*, to cover sin, and so to expiate; and it is never used in the sense of *breaking* or *dissolving* a covenant, though that notion occurs so often in the Scriptures; nor can it be forced into this sense, but by a great deal of far-fetched reasoning. See Isaiah xxviii. 18. *Lowth on Isaiah, Prelim. Diss.*

כפר, says Castle, "textuit, operuit, Anglice, to *cover*; per metathesis, *μερστω, μερσθη*, peculiariter bitumine, sive glutinosa aliqua materia obdudit; picavit;" Gen. vi. 14.

Parkhurst gives to this verb the sense of *covering* or *overspreading*, as primary; and deduces from it the Greek *μερστω*, and English *cover* and *coffer*. He, however, admits that in Isaiah xxviii. 18, it signifies to annul, as a covenant. He also considers the sense of atonement or expiation to be radically that of *covering*.

Gesenius agrees with the English lexicographers, in assigning to this verb the primary sense of *covering* or *overlaying*, as in Gen. vi. 14. He admits that this word has the sense, in Isaiah xxviii. 18, of *blotting out, obliterating*. But he gives to it the sense of *forgiving*, in some passages, in which our version has that of *purging away*; Ps. lxx. 3; and lxxix. 9. In these passages, Castle renders the word, to be *merciful* or *propitious*.

In all these authors there is, we conceive, a radical mistake, in supposing the primary sense to be to *cover*, and in the opinion that this Hebrew word is the English verb to *cover*. A still greater mistake is in the supposition of Castle and Parkhurst, that this, by a metathesis, gives the Greek *μερστω*.

The English word *cover* comes to us through the French *couvrir*, from the Italian *coprire*, a contraction of the Latin *co-operto*, whence *co-opertus*, Italian *coperto*, covered, Eng. *covert*.* The Latin *aperio*, is to open, and *operio*, is to cover, both from *pario*, or one of the roots in *Br*, which has just been explained. The root in these words is *per* or *par*, and the sense is varied by prefixes; perhaps *ad-pario* or *ab-pario* and *ob-pario*. Now *cover* can have no connection with כפר, unless this latter word is a compound, with כ for a prefix. This may be the fact, but the connection, even in that case, is very remote.

Let us see if we can gain any light upon the subject of the primary sense of כפר from the cognate languages.

Chaldee, כפר, to deny, to reject; Prov. xxx. 9.

2. To wipe; "She eateth and *wipeth* her mouth;" Prov. xxx. 20.

3. To wash or cleanse; Matt. xxvii. 24.

Castle.

Syriac, ܕܟܦܪ *kafar*, to deny; Gen. xviii. 15; Luke xii. 9.

2. To wipe, to wipe away; to annul, to abolish; Prov. xxx. 20; Is. xxviii. 18.

Castle.

Arabic, ڪفر *kafara*, to deny; to disbelieve; to be an infidel; to be impious; to blaspheme; Acts iii. 13, 14; 2 Pet. ii. 1, 5; Jude 15.

2. To cover; to conceal.

3. To expiate; to make expiation for one, and free him from crime.

Castle.

Now the senses of the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, to *deny*, to *reject*, to *annul*, to *wipe*, *wash*, or to *cleanse* by these acts, cannot be deduced from *covering*.

In Hebrew, the word has the sense of *covering*, as the ark, with bitumen or pitch, in Gen vi. 14; that is, to *smear*, or *pay over*, as our seamen now express it. But it should be considered that the sense of *covering* is rarely or never *primary*; it is usually from the sense of *putting on*, which is from the sense of *throwing* or *pressing*, or it is from *overspreading*, which is a *spreading, stretching, or throwing over*; hence the

derivative senses of *covering* and *hiding*. These latter senses are sometimes derived from others; but these are the most general. And in this passage of Genesis, the literal sense is probably to put on, or to *rub* or *spread* over, a sense which coincides with that of the Chaldee and Syriac, Prov. xxx. 20, though differently applied; or what is more probable, the verb, in Gen. vi. 14, is from the noun, which is the name of the substance used, as we should say, to *pitch* with *pitch*.

The real original sense of this Shemitic verb is to remove, to separate, by thrusting away or driving off. Hence its application, in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, to denial, the rejection of God or truth. To *deny* or *reject*, is to thrust away. Hence from the Arabic *kafar*, an infidel, one who denies and rejects the Mohammedan religion; hence *Caffrara*, the southern part of Africa, the country of infidels; so called by the followers of Mohammed, just as the Christians gave the name of *pagans* to the inhabitants of villages [*pagus*,] who rejected the Christian religion.

This signification explains the Hebrew uses of this word. Its literal sense is applied to the cleansing or purification of sacred things, as the altar; Lev. xvi. 18. In a spiritual sense, to the purification of the soul, a type of the purification by the blood of Christ; hence it is rendered *atonement*, or *expiation*. Hence, probably, the sense of appeasing, Gen. xxiii. 21; Prov. xvi. 14, though this may be from removing or smoothing.

The sense of forgiveness is from thrusting away or giving back, precisely as in the modern languages; Lat. *remitto*, to send back or away; *forgive*, to give back or away; *pardon*, in French, Spanish, and Italian, has a like sense, which is more clearly exhibited by the Dutch *vergeeven*, German *vergeben*; *ver* being the English *far*, to give far, to give away; hence to reject, and remember no more. The sense of *give* and of the French *donner*, is nearly the same as that of כפר. To *give*, is to send, to cause to pass; and so of *donner*.

Now it is a question of some moment, whether the opinion that כפר is the same as the English *cover*, has not inclined lexicographers and commentators to render it by this word, in several passages, where the true sense is to *forgive*, or to purify by cleansing from sin.

However this may be, the interpretation given above will fully disprove Lowth's assertion, that this word is never used in the sense of *breaking* or *annulling* a covenant. So confident is the learned Bishop on this point, that he ventures to call in question the reading, Isaiah xxviii. 18; and to suppose the true word to be כפר, from כפר, to break. With respect to the reading we shall offer no opinion; but if the present reading is correct, we are confident that no word in the Hebrew language is better fitted to express the sense. Your covenant with death shall be *wiped away, abolished*, or as in the version, *annulled*. And so is the rendering in the Syriac.

If כפר is a compound word and the first letter a prefix, it

may be from the same root as the Arabic ڪفر *kafara*, whose

signification is to cover. But the primary sense is, to throw or put on. It signifies also, to *forgive*; but to forgive is to send back or away, *remitto*, and not to cover. And we apprehend that for want of knowing the primary sense of such verbs, the word *cover* has been often substituted for *forgive*, in the translating of this verb.

כל *kal* or *kol*.

No. 1. Heb. כל *kal*, to hold, to contain; Sw. *halla*. כלכל *kalal*, to hold, to sustain, to maintain, to comprehend.

Ch. כלל *kalal*, to measure, that is, to ascertain the contents, or to stretch, and comprehend the whole.

Pah. To feed, to nourish. See אכל.

Deriv. A measure; also custom, rite, manner, probably from holding or continued practice.

Syr. In Aph. to measure. Deriv. A measure.

Eth. ለከለ, to follow; to go behind; Gr. ἀκολουθω; that is, to hold to, or to press after.

* In this deduction of *cover* from the Latin, we are supported by Lunier, the ablest French etymologist whose works we have seen.

Deriv. The hinder part; the poop of a ship; behind. French *cul*.

No. 2. Heb. כָּלַּל to finish; to complete; to make perfect. Gr. *καλῶς*.

כָּל *all*; the whole; Gr. *ἅλως*, Eng. *all*, by the loss of the first letter; but in Welsh *holl*, or *oill*; and in Saxon *al*, *æl*, and *geall*.

Ch. כָּלַל to crown; to adorn.

Ph. לָּו to perfect; to complete; to comprehend; to embrace.

Deriv. Comprehending; universality, a general rule, &c.

Syr. ܠܐܠܐ to crown Deriv. A crown; all; every one.

Sam. כָּלַל as the Chaldee.

Eth. ከሰሰ, the same; also, to cover.

Ar. كَلَّ *kalla*, to be weary or dull; to be languid; to tire; also, to crown; to shine. Deriv. All; dullness; heaviness.

No. 3. Heb. כָּלַל to hold; to restrain; to shut or confine;

to check; Gr. *καλῶς*; Sw. *hålla*.

Deriv. A place of confinement; Lat. *caula*.

Ch. כָּלַל to hold; to restrain; also, to trust; to confide in, or rely on; to hope. (See No. 6.) Also, to finish; to perfect; also, to consume; to cause to fail.

In Aph. To call; to cry out; to thunder; Gr. *καλῶς*; Lat. *calo*; W. *galw*; Eng. to call; Lat. *gallus*, from crowing.

Syr. ܠܐܠܐ, to hold; to restrain; to forbid; to deny.

Deriv. *all*; a cork, bar or bolt.

Sam. כָּלַל, to hold, or restrain.

Eth. ከሰሰ, to hold, restrain, or prohibit.

Deriv. Lat. *alius*; a fellow, or companion.

Ar. كَلَّ *kala*, to keep; to preserve; to turn the face toward a thing and look repeatedly. So in English, to *behold*. Also, to come to the end, as of life; also, to feed, to devour food; also, to abound in pasture; also, to hinder, or detain; also, to look attentively; also, to sprout; also, to take upon a pledge, or upon trust; supra, Chaldee. (See No. 6.)

No. 4. Heb. כָּלַל to finish; to consume; to bring to naught; to waste; to fail. (See No. 8.)

No. 5. Ch. כָּלַל to eat; to consume; also, to take; to hold; to contain. In Aph. to feed; to give food; also, to call; to thunder; to roar, or bellow; also, to publish; to accuse; to defame.

Heb. to eat; to consume.

Sam. כָּלַל, to eat.

Syr. ܠܐܠܐ, to publish; to divulge, as a crime; to accuse.

Eth. ከሰሰ, to suffice, as we say, it is well, Lat. *valere*; also, to be or exist; that is, to be *held*, or to be fixed or permanent, to continue.

Ar. to eat; to devour; to corrode; Lat. *helluor*.

No. 6. Ar. كَلَّ *wakala*, to trust; to commit to another in confidence. (See No. 3.)

Eth. ወከለ *wakal*, with a prefix; to trust, as above.

No. 7. Heb. כָּלַל to be able; to prevail; Lat. *calleo*; W. *gallu*; Eng. *could*.

No. 8. Ch. כָּלַל to digest; to consume. (No. 5.)

Ar. كَلَّ *shakala*, to collect; to tie; to bind; to unite; also, to divide, impel, or compel. This is the primary sense of the word, or rather of this root; to press; to strain; to urge, or impel; also, to extend. These verbs are different modifications of one radix *sh* and hence the English *hold*, *call*, *hollow*,

heal, *hale*; the Latin *calo*, *caulis*, *calleo*, *callus*; Greek *καλῶς*, *καλῶς* or *καλλῶς*; and a multitude of words in all the modern languages of Europe.

The sense of holding, restraining, forbidding, hindering, and keeping, are too obvious to need any explanation. They are from straining. To this sense is nearly allied the sense of measuring, or ascertaining what is held or contained. That which is contained is *all*, the *whole* that is comprehended, from the sense of extension.

The signification of finishing or perfecting, seems, in a good sense, to be from that of soundness; a sense which is from stretching or strength. Or it may be from *coming* to the end, like *finish* and *achieve*, or from *shutting*, *closing*. And the sense of consuming, wasting, failing, may be from *bringing* to an end. In Latin, to *consume* is to *take all*; and possibly this may be the sense of this verb. But the Arabic sense of failure would seem rather to be from holding, stopping, or coming to an end.

The sense of eating may be from consuming, or taking apart, but from some of the derivatives of No. 5, we are inclined to think the primary sense is to feed, to crowd, to stuff; the primary sense of the root applied to this particular act; for under the Chaldee root we find words which signify the nut of a species of oak, the Gr. *αχυλῶς*, and a collection or crowd of people, [Gr. *εχλῶς*,] both of which are from collecting or pressing together.

The sense of *seeing* and *looking* is from *reaching* or *casting* and *striking*, or from *holding* or *fixing* the eyes on.

The sense of *trusting* seems also to be that of *holding* to or *resting on*. The English *hold* in *behold* is from this root.

The sense of *calling*, *roaring*, and *thunder*, is from impelling the voice or sound; a pressing, driving, or straining, applied to sound; like the Latin *appello*, from *pello*. Hence the sense of publishing, accusing, and defaming.

The sense of sprouting, in the Arabic, is a shooting or pushing out, as in other cases; Lat. *caulis*.

The sense of ability, power, strength, in No. 7, is from straining, stretching, or holding, as in other words of the like sense. Hence Lat. *calleo*, to be skilled, and to be hard, *callus*.

On this root כָּל is probably formed כָּל, a word differently pointed in the Hebrew and Chaldee. This word signifies in Hebrew, to pervert, to err, to be foolish or infatuated, to act foolishly.

In Chaldee, to understand, know or consider; to look or behold; to cause to understand; Rabbinic, to be ignorant; whence its derivatives, knowledge, wisdom, ignorance. These different significations may result from the different effects of the prefix on the original verb.

In Syr. ܠܐܠܐ (the same word) signifies to be foolish, or mad; to cause to know, or to give understanding; to observe; to search or know thoroughly; to ask or seek to understand; to discern or distinguish; also to err, to sin, to be foolish, or perverse.

In Sam. the same word signifies to look, and to be accused. See Castell. col. 2523.

That כָּל is formed on the same root with a different prefix, is obvious and certain, from the correspondence of significations. This word in Hebrew signifies to understand, or know; to cause to understand; to be wise, or to act wisely; corresponding with the Ch. כָּל above; and being a mere dialectical orthography of the word. It signifies also, to deprive, strip, bereave; and to waste, scatter and destroy; also, to cast, as fruit or offspring; also, to prosper.

Ch. to understand, and Ch. כָּל, to complete, to finish; also, to found, to lay the foundation. This is כָּל with *w* prefixed.

Syr. to found, to finish, to adorn.

Ar. كَلَّ *shakala*, to bind under the belly; to gird; to bind the feet; to fetter; to *shackle*; to form, or fashion; to be dubious, obscure, and intricate; to agree, suit, or answer to; to be like; to have a beautiful form; to know, perceive, or comprehend; to hesitate; to be ignorant. Derivative, a *shackle*, See Castell. col. 3750.

To this root Castle refers the English *skill*; and it is

certain the words correspond both in elements and in sense. Now in the Gothic and Teutonic languages, the verbs corresponding to these Shemitic verbs, signify in Saxon, *scylan*, to separate, to distinguish; Icelandic and Swedish, *skilja*, to divide, separate, sever; whence *shield*, that which separates, and hence defends; D. *scheelen*, to differ; *schillen*, to peel, or pare; whence *scale* and *shell*. To this root our lexicographers refer *skill*. The prefix in this word would seem to have the force of a negative, like L. *ex*. Now is it possible to suppose that these words can be formed from a common root?

The sense of *sin* and *folly* is probably from wandering, deviating, as in delirium; and this is only a modification of the primary sense of *לל* to stretch or extend; that is, departure, separation. Or the *ש* has, in these senses, the force of a negative.

The sense of *knowing*, *understanding*, is usually or always from *taking*, *holding*, or *extending to*; as we say, I take your meaning. In this application these words would seem to be directly from the Eth. and Ch. כדל, to be able; the Latin *calleo*, to be hard, and to know or be well *skilled*. That this word כדל is from the same root as כלל כדל we know by the Samaritan כדל, which signifies *all*, and which is a mere dialectical spelling of the Heb. and Ch. כל.

The sense of depriving and wasting, in the Hebrew, is from separation, the sense of the Gothic and Teutonic words; but it is to be noticed that this sense seems to imply throwing, as one mode of parting, and this is also the direct act of founding, laying the foundation.

When we turn our attention to the Arabic, new affinities are disclosed. The first definition is, to *bind*, to *gird*, to *shackle*, and hence the English word. The radical sense of *bind* is to strain, the sense of *hold*. And here we arrive at the origin and primary sense of *shall*, *should*; Saxon *scealan*, to be obliged; that is, to be bound or constrained. Hence we see why the words *scale*, *shell* and *shall*, are all written alike in Saxon, *seal*; for *scale* and *shell* are from peeling, or covering, binding.

From this verb the Saxon has *scyld*, a crime, or guilt, Lat. *scelus*, and *scyld*, a shield. The German has the same word in *schuld*, guilt, culpability, debt; Dutch, *schuld*; Danish *skulde*, should, and *scyld*, a debt, a fault, a crime; Sw. *skuld*, the same. This word *scyld*, *skuld*, and *schuld*, is the English *should*, the preterite of the verb *shall*; and it is the word used in the Saxon, German, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, and Swiss Lord's Prayer, to express what is rendered in English *debts*; forgive us our *debts*. Here we see the primary sense of the word is to be *held*, or bound; hence, liable. The English word *guilt* may be from the same root, without a prefix; but whether it is or not, we observe the word expresses more than the English word debt, trespass, or offence; it comprehends the sense of *fault*, or *sin*, with that of being *held*, or *liable* to answer or to punishment. *Debt*, in the modern use of the word, implies the latter, but not the former; *trespass* and *offence* imply the *sin*, but not the liability to answer. We have no English word that includes both senses, except *guilt*, and this seems to be hardly adequate to express the full sense of *scyld*.

To account for the various significations of the same word, in different languages, and often in the same language, it is necessary to find the primary action expressed by the root; and in compound words it is necessary to observe or ascertain the different effects produced on the original word by the prefixes. Thus the verb *inculpate* in Low Latin signifies to *excuse*; but some modern writers use *inculpate* in a directly different sense; that is, to *blame*.

In like manner *impartible* has two different significations; that may be *imparted*; and in law, *not partible*, or divisible. Such is the fact also with *impassionate*. We are persuaded a vast number of instances of similar diversities in the application of prefixes may be found in the Shemitic languages; and this will account for differences which otherwise seem utterly irreconcilable.

We find in our mother tongue, that the same word signifies to *heal*, and to *conceal*, Lat. *celo*; Saxon *hel*, health; *helan*, *helan*, to heal, to conceal; *ge-helan*, and *ge-helan*, to heal, and to conceal; Old English *hele*. Hence we see that the English

heal and the Latin *celo* are the same word differently applied, but from a common signification, which is to make strong or fast, or to hold, from the sense of pressing. Or perhaps the Latin *celo* may have this sense of holding, restraining; and *heal* may rather be from making perfect. No. 2, supra.

We may now also see the radical sense of *holy*; Saxon *hal* and *ge-hal*, whole, sound, safe; *halig*, holy; *halgian*, to hallow. If this word contains the sense of separation, or driving off, like Latin *sacer*, as it may, it is from shutting, confining, or restraining intercourse. But we are inclined to believe the primary sense of *holy* is sound, entire, coinciding with the radical sense of *heal*.

Clod, Laudo, Claudio.

In Welsh, *clod* is praise, from *llod*, a forcible utterance. This is the English *loud*, and Lat. *laudo*, which, with a prefix, becomes *plaudo*. In Welsh, *llodi* signifies to reach out, to crave, from the radical sense of *llod*, to thrust out or extend; but according to Owen, *llodi* is from *llawod*, which signifies a shooting out, or a going onward, productiveness, a *lad*, and as an adjective, tending forward, craving, *leod*; *llodig*, craving, brimming; *llodineb*, lewdness. Now, beyond all question, these words are the Chaldee, Syriac, Hebrew, and Samaritan כדל, to beget; to bring forth; to cause to be born; and as a noun, a child of either sex, a *lad*. The Arabians and Ethiopians use *vau* or *vau*, where the Hebrews use *yod*. The Arabic

corresponding word is *walada*, the Ethiopic *walad*, to beget, to bring forth.

But this is not all. In Greek, the verb *κλιω*, a contraction of *κλινω*, signifies to praise, to celebrate. Here we have precisely the Welsh *llod* above, corresponding with the Latin *laudo* and *plaudo*. But the same Greek word *κλιω*, *κλινω*, signifies to shut or make fast. This is the Latin *cludo*, *claudio*. The Saxons used *h* for the Greek *κ* and the Latin *c*; and with these words accords the Saxon *hlid*, a cover; English, a *lid*; that which shuts or makes fast. That these words are all from one root, is a fact, apparent beyond any reasonable doubt; nor is there the least difficulty in ascertaining the affinity, for the radical sense, to reach forward, to thrust, to strain, solves the whole mystery. To *thrust*, gives the sense of begetting and producing; to strain or throw out the voice, gives the sense of praise: and to thrust or press together, gives the sense of closing and making fast. In this manner, words, which at first view appear to have no connection, will, when pursued through different languages, assimilate and unite, not only without forced analogies, but in defiance of all preconceived opinions; and the reluctant mind is at last compelled to admit their identity.

There is another set of words whose derivation from the same root is very certain, though perhaps less obvious. These are the Danish *slutter*, to shut, close, conclude, finish, determine; *slutter*, a key-keeper, a jailer; Swedish *sluta*, claudere, obserare, to shut, or shut up, or end; *slott*, a castle; D. *steutel*, a key; *slot*, a lock, a castle, a conclusion; *sluiten*, to shut, lock, close, stop, conclude; G. *schloss*, a lock; *schliessen*, to close, conclude, finish, fetter, shackle; *schliessen*, a sluice; D. *sluis*, id. Eng. *sluice*, that is, which shuts or fastens; Low Latin, *exclusa*. See *Spelman's Glossary*. These words are unequivocally formed from the root of *claudio*, *clausi*, by the prefix *s*, just as the Welsh *yslac*, slack, loose, is formed on *llac*, and *yspeluio*, on *yspail*, spoil, and this on the root of *peel*. We observe all the Teutonic dialects use the dental *t*, as the final radical, except the German. The Latins use both the dental and a sibilant, *claudio*, *clausi*, *clausus*.

If the Danish *lyd*, sound, Sw. *lyda*, to sound, is the same word as English *loud*, these words belong to this family.

Cradle.

Another example. The English word *cradle*, Saxon *cradel*, is in Welsh *cryd*, a rocking, a shaking, a *cradle*. In Welsh, the verbs *crydu*, *crydiaw*, *crydian*, signify to shake, to tremble. These correspond to the Irish *creatham*, to shake; Greek *κρᾶναι*, to shake, to swing. The Welsh verbs are by Owen deduced from *rhwyd*, which signifies a moving. Now *רד* in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Ethiopic, signifies to shake or tremble.

The same word in Arabic, ^{رعد} رعد, signifies to thunder; to impress terror; to tremble; to shake. This coincides with the Latin *rudo*, to roar, to bray; and we know from the voice of the ass, that roughness or shaking is an ingredient in the sense of this word. We know it also from *rudis*, one of the

affinities of *rudo*. There is also in Arabic, ^{ردي} ردي, which is rendered to run hither and thither; to move one way and the other; to tremble; to shake. In Hebrew רדד signifies to tremble or shake, and to palpitate; in Syriac and Eth. to rub or scrape. This connects the word directly with *cradle*, through the Hebrew; and through the Syriac, with the Latin *rado*. Here again we find the sense of roughness or grating. Then turning to the Welsh, we find *grydiau*, which signifies to utter a rough sound; to shout, whoop, or scream; *gryduost*, a murmur, from *gryd*, a shout or whoop, and this from *ryhd*, the word above mentioned; so that *crydu*, to shake, whence *cradle*, is from the same root as *grydiau*, to shout, and this is the Italian *gridare*; Sp. and Port. *gritar*; Saxon *grædan*; Swedish

grata; Danish *græder*; Dutch *kryten*; German *greiten*. This word in French is contracted, by the omission of the last radical, into *crier* for *crider*; whence, probably, we have *cry*, W. *cri*. Hence we find that the sense of *cry* is to utter a rough sound; and this is connected with the braying of the ass, with shaking, trembling, and with roaring, murmuring, and thunder. The connection in this example is so marked as to preclude all hesitation as to the identity of the words.

The Shemitic roots ^{קרי} קרי, ^{קריד} קריד, and ^{קריד} קריד, all, in some of the languages of that stock, coincide in sense and elements with the English *grate*, French *gratter*; and if the first letter is a prefix, they would seem to unite with the Latin *rado*. But this is a point we would not undertake to determine.

One fact more. The Welsh *cri*, above mentioned, signifies a *cry*; and as an adjective, rough, raw. Now this coincides with the Latin *crudus*, in sense; and *crudus* with the Welsh *cryd*, above mentioned.

The Dan. *brygger*. Eng. to *brew*, are probably connected with *break*, with *freckle*, and with *rough*. So under this root, the Welsh *grediau*, signifies to heat, scorch, parch, whence *greidyll*, a griddle, from *graid*, that shoots in rays, heat, ardency, from *gra*, that shoots, or rises, as the nap or frieze of cloth. The latter is probably a contracted word, of the same family, but not the root, as Owen supposes. But the radical sense implies a shaking, agitation, and roughness.

Meet, Mete, Measure.

SAXON.—*Melan*, to put, to place; Fr. *mettre*, It. *mettere*, Sp. and Port. *meter*, Lat. *mitto*.

Melan, *melan*, to find, to *meet*, or *met* with; to paint; to dream; to *measure*, to *metre*, Lat. *metior*, *metor*, Gr. ^{μετροω} μετροω, ^{μετρον} μετρον, Lat. *mensus*, with a casual *n*, that is, *mesus*, Fr. *mésure*.

Amelan, *gemelan*, to *meet*, to find, to measure.

Gemeling, *gemelung*, a *meeting*.

Gemet, *gemelte*, fit, suitable, Eng. *meet*; also, painted or portrayed.

Gemetegan, *gemetian*, to *moderate*; *gemettic*, *moderate*, *modest*.

Mete, *measure*, *moder*, Lat. *modius*, *modus*.

Metre, measure in verse, meter [not *metre*].

Metere, an inventor, a painter.

Mete, middling [*mediocris*,] *modest*, *moderate*.

Mot, *gemot*, a *meeting*, a council.

Witena-gemot, a council of wise men.

Motian, to *meet*, especially for debate. Eng. to *moot*.

GOthic.—*Motyian*, *gamotyian*, to *meet*, to find.

Mota, a place for the receipt of toll or customs.

Dutch.—*Ontmoeten*, to *meet*, to encounter.

Meeten, and *toemeeten*, to *measure*.

Meeter, a *measurer*.

Gemoeten, to *meet*; *gemoet*, a *meeting*.

GERMAN.—*Mass*, *measure*, *meter*; *masse*, *moderation*.

Messen, *vermessen*, to *measure*; *messer*, a *measurer*.

Gemäss, *measure*; also conformable, suitable; Eng. *meet*, suitable; German *gemässigt*, temperate, *moderate*.

SWEDISH.—*Möta*, to *meet*, to fall on, to come to, to happen. [This is the sense of *finding*.]

Möte, a *meeting*.

Mot, and *emot*, toward, against; as in *motstå*, to stand against, to resist.

Måla, to *measure*; *mått*, *measure*, *meter*, *mode*.

Måttelig, *moderate*, *middling*, frugal, temperate.

Mutta, to be sufficient, to satisfy, to cloy.

DANISH.—*Möder*, to *meet*, to convene; *møde* or *mode*, a *meeting*; *mod*, contrary, opposite, against, to, toward, for, on, by, aside, abreast, as in *modsetter*, to set against, to oppose; *modsiget*, to say against, to contradict; *modvind*, a contrary wind.

Moed, *moden*, ripe, mellow, *mature*. [Qu. Lat. *mitis*.]

Mode, manner, fashion. [Probably from the Latin.]

Maade, *measure*, form, style of writing, way, mode, manner, fashion. [This is the native Danish word corresponding to the Lat. *modus*.]

Maadelig, *moderate*, temperate.

Met, enough, sufficient; *matter*, to satisfy, or sate, to glut.

From the same root are the G. *mit*, D. *met*, *mede*, Sw. and Dan. *med*, Gr. ^{μετα} μετα, signifying *with*.

By the first signification of the Saxon *melan*, or *melan*, we find that this word, which is the English *meet*, is also the French *mettre*, and Lat. *mitto*, the sense of which is to throw or send, to put, to lay. *Meet* is only a modification of the same sense, to come to, to fall, to reach, hence to find; as we say, to *fall on*.

The sense of painting or pouring is peculiar to the Saxon. We are not confident that this sense is from finding; but we observe that *metere* is rendered an inventor and a painter. The sense of *paint*, then, may be to find out, to devise, or contrive.

The sense of dreaming is also peculiar to the Saxon. The sense may be to devise or imagine, or it may be to *roze*, as in some other words of like signification. If so, this sense will accord with the Syriac ^{סו} סו, infra.

The other significations present no difficulty. To *meet*, is to come to, to reach in proceeding or in extending; hence to find. The primary sense of *measure* is to extend, to stretch to the full length or size of a thing.

Meet, fit, suitable, like *par*, *peer*, *pair*, is from extending or reaching to. So *suit* is from the Latin *sequor*, through the French, to follow, to press, or reach toward. See *par*, under ^{בא} בא, supra.

The English *meet* and *mete* appear to be from the Saxon dialect, but *moot* from the Gothic.

Let it be remarked that the Saxon *meet* and *mete*, are united in the same orthography; and in the Dutch the orthography is not very different; *ontmoeten*, *gemoeten*, to *meet*, and *meeten*, to *measure*. Not so in the other languages.

In German, *mass* is *measure*, and *messen*, to *measure*; but the sense of *meet* does not occur. Yet that *mass* is the same word as *meet*, fit, varied only in dialect, appears from this, that *gemäss*, with a prefix, is suitable, answering to the English *meet*.

The Swedish and Danish words follow the Gothic orthography; Swedish *möta*, to *meet*, to fall on, to come to, to happen. These significations give the sense of finding, and

are closely allied to the senses of the Arabic verb ^{مدا} مدا, infra.

The Danish verb is *möder*, to *meet*, but in both the Swedish and Danish, the sense of measure is expressed by a different

orthography. Sw. *måla*, to *measure*; *mått*, *measure*; Dan. *maade*, *measure*, *mode*. In these two languages we find also

the sense of sufficiency, and to satisfy. See infra, the Ar. ^{مد} مد and Heb. and Ch. ^{מצא} מצא.

But in these Gothic dialects, there is one application of *meeting* which deserves more particular notice. In Swedish, *mot* and *emot* is a preposition of the same signification as the English *against*. It is rendered toward, against. So in Danish, *mod* is contrary, opposite, against, to, toward, by, aside, abreast. This preposition is the simple verb, without any addition of letters, prefix or suffix. We hence learn that the sense of such prepositions is a meeting or coming to, which gives the sense of *to or toward*; but when one meets another in front, it gives the sense of opposition, or contrary direction. This coming to or meeting, may be for a friendly purpose, and hence in one's favour, like *for* in English. Thus in Danish, "Guds godhed *mod* os," God's goodness or mercy toward us. In other cases, *mod* signifies against, and implies counteraction or opposition; as *modgift*, an antidote; *modgang*, adversity. So *for* in English signifies toward, or in favour of; and also opposition and negation, as in *forbid*.

In the Danish we find *moed*, *moden*, ripe, *mature*. We shall see this sense in the Chaldee מִתָּה. The sense is to reach, extend, or come to.

The Latin *modus* is from this root, and, by its orthography, it seems to have been received from the Gothic race. The sense is measure, limit, from extending, or comprehending. This then becomes the radix of many words which express limitation or restraint, as *moderate*, *modest*, *modify*; a sense directly contrary to that of the radical verb.

This leads us a step further. In Saxon, Gothic, and other northern languages, *mod*, *moed*, signifies mind, courage, spirit, anger, whence English *moody*. The primary sense is an advancing or rushing forward, which expresses mind or intention, that is, a setting or stretching forward, and also spirit, animation, heat, and lastly, anger. So the Latin *animus* gives rise to *animosity*; and the Greek *μανία*, mind, signifies also, strength, force, vehemence, and anger. *Mania* is from the same radical sense.

Let us now connect this root or these roots, with the Shemitic languages.

In Hebrew and Chaldee, מִדֵּר signifies to measure; מִדָּר, a measure. This coincides with the Latin *metior*, and Gr. μέτρον, as well as with the Saxon, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish, which all write the word with a dental, but the German is *mass*.

In Syriac, ܡܕܐ *mad*, signifies to escape, to get free, that is, to depart, a modification of the sense of extending in the Arabic. A derivative in Syriac signifies a duty, toll or tribute; and we have seen in the Gothic, that *meta* is a toll-house. It may be from measuring, that is, a portion, or perhaps income.

This word in Arabic, مَدَّ *madda*, signifies,

1. To stretch or extend, to draw out, to make or be long, to delay or give time, to forbear, to bring forth. To extend is the radical sense of *measure*.

2. To separate, or throw off or out; to discern, secrete, or discharge. Hence to become *matter* or sanies, to produce pus, to *maturate*. Here we have the origin of the word *matter*, in the sense of *pus*. It is an excretion, from throwing out, separating, freeing, discharging. Here we have the sense of the Latin *mitto*, *emitto*.

3. To assist, to supply. This sense is probably from coming to, that is, to approach or visit. "I was sick, and ye visited me. I was in prison, and ye came to me." Matt. xxv.

This application coincides with the English *meet*, but particularly with the Swedish and Danish sense of the word.

4. To make thin, to attenuate; probably from stretching. Among the Arabic nouns formed under this root, we find a *measure*, or *modius*, showing that this verb is the same as the Chaldee and Hebrew; we find also *matter* or *pus*, and lenity. Qu. Lat. *mitis*.

In Chaldee, מִתָּה or מִתָּה signifies to come to, to happen, to reach, [to *meet*,] to be ripe or *mature*, to cause to come, to bring or produce. The first sense gives that of finding, and the latter gives that of maturing, and we observe that *matter*,

or *pus*, is from the Arabic مَدَّ *madda*, and the sense of *mature*, from the Chaldee מִתָּה *mita*. Yet in the use of *maturate*,

from the Latin *maturus*, we connect the words, for to *maturate* is to ripen, and to generate *matter*.

In Syriac, this verb signifies the same as the Chaldee, to come to; and also to be strong, to prevail, that is, to strain or stretch, the radical sense of power.

In Hebrew, מִתָּה has the sense of the foregoing verb in the Chaldee, to find, to come to, to happen.

In Chaldee, this verb signifies to find, and to be strong, to prevail; hence both in Hebrew and Chaldee, to be sufficient. Here we see the Danish and Swedish *metter*, and *mätta*, to be sufficient. This is also *meet*, dialectically varied.

In Syriac, also, this verb signifies to be strong or powerful; also in Pah. to bring or press out, to defecate, which sense unites this word with the Heb. מִתָּה. to press, to squeeze. In Ethiopic, this verb signifies to come, to happen, to cause to come, to bring in, to bring forth. Now it is evident that מִתָּה and the Chaldee מִתָּה are dialectical forms of the same word; the former coinciding with the German *mass* in orthography, but with the other languages in signification.

In Chaldee, מִתָּה signifies the *middle*, and as a verb, to set in the middle, to pass the middle; in Syriac, to be divided in the middle. Qu. Is not this a branch of the family of *meet*?

In Chaldee, מִתָּה *amad*, to measure, is evidently from מִדָּר, with a prefix or formative אֶ. This word, in Syriac, signifies, like the simple verb, to escape, to be liberated. In Pahl., to liberate.

In Arabic, this verb أَمَدَ *amida*, signifies to be terminated,

to end, whence the noun, an end, limit, termination, Latin *meta*, which, Ainsworth informs us, signifies, in a *metaphorical* sense, a limit. The fact is the reverse; this is its *primary* and *literal* sense, and that of a pillar and goal are particular appropriations of that sense.

In Hebrew, מִדָּר signifies a cubit, a measure of length.

The same in the Rabbinic, from מִדָּר with a prefix.

In Chaldee, this verb signifies to be contracted, to shrink.

Is not this sense from מִדָּר measure, *modus*, a limit, or a drawing.

That the Shemitic words, מִדָּר, מִתָּה, and מִדָּר are words of the same stock with *meet*, *mete*, Lat. *metior*, there can be no doubt; but it is not easy to understand why the different significations of *meeting* and *measuring*, should be united in one word, in the Saxon language, when they are expressed by very different words in the Shemitic, and in most of the Teutonic languages. We know, indeed, that in German a sibilant letter is often used, in words which are written with a dental in all the other kindred languages. But in this case the German *mass*, measure, must coincide with *mi*, as must the Swedish *måla*, and Dan. *maade*, and the Saxon *metan*, Dutch *gemooten*, Goth. *motyan*, Sw. *möla*, Dan. *møder*, with the Chaldee מִתָּה but not with the word מִדָּר.

It may not be impossible nor improbable that all these words are from one stock or radix, and that the different orthographies and applications are dialectical changes of that root, introduced among different families or races of men, before languages were reduced to writing.

In the Latin *mensus*, from *metior*, the *n* is probably casual, the original being *mesus*, as in the French *mesure*. We have reason to think there are many instances of this insertion of *n* before *d* and *s*.

From this exhibition of words and their significations, we may fairly infer the common origin of the following words. Lat. *mitto*, French *mettre*, English *meet*, to come to, *meet*, fit, and *mete*, to measure, Lat. *metior*, *metor*, G. μέτρον, μέτρον, Lat. *mensura*, Fr. *mésure*, Eng. *measure*, Lat. *modus*, mode, Sax. and Goth. *mod*, mind, anger, whence *moody*, Eng. *mool*, Lat. *maturus*, mature, and Eng. *matter*.

In Welsh, *madu* signifies to cause to proceed; to send, [Lat. *mitto*.] to suffer to go off; to render productive; to become beneficial; and *mad* signifies what proceeds or goes forward, hence what is good; and *mad*, the adjective, signifies proceeding, advancing, progressive, good or beneficial. This word then affords a clear proof of the radical sense of *good*. We have like evidence in the English *better*, *best*, and in *prosperity*, which is from the Greek ἀγαθός, to advance.

In Welsh also we find *madrez*, *matter*, pus; *madru*, to dissolve, to putrefy, to become pus. That these words are from

the same root as the Arabic *ماد* supra, we think to be very obvious; and here we observe that the Welsh have one important sense derived from the root, that of *good*, which occurs in none of the other languages. But the primary sense is the same as that of the other significations, to go forward, to advance; hence to promote interest or happiness. Here we have undeniable evidence that the sense of *good*, Welsh *mad*, and the sense of *matter*, pus, proceed from the same radix.

LEGO.

The Greek *λογω* is rendered, to speak or say; to tell, count, or number; to gather, collect, or choose; to discourse; and to lie down. This last definition shows that this word is the English *lie* and *lay*; and from this application, doubtless, the Latins had their *lectus*, a bed, that is, a spread, a lay.

The Latin *lego*, the same verb, is rendered, to gather; to choose; to read; to steal, or collect by stealing; and the phrase, *legere oram*, signifies to coast, to sail along a coast; *legere vela*, is to furl the sails; *legere halitum*, to take breath; *legere litus*, to sail close to the shore; *legere milites*, to enlist or muster soldiers; *legere pugno*, to strike, perhaps to *lay on* with the fist.

It would seem, at first view, that such various significations cannot proceed from one radix. But the fact that they do is indubitable. The primary sense of the root must be to throw, strain or extend, which in this, as in almost all cases, gives the sense of *speaking*. The sense of collecting, choosing, gathering, is from throwing, or drawing out, or separating by some such act; or from throwing together. The sense of lying down is probably, from throwing one's self down. The sense of reading, in Latin, is the same as that of speaking, in the Greek, unless it may be from collecting, that is, separating the letters, and uniting them in syllables and words; for in the primitive mode of writing, diacritical points were not used. But probably the sense of *reading* is the same as in *speaking*.

The phrases *legere oram*, *legere litus*, in Latin, may coincide with that of our seamen, to stretch or *lay* along the shore or coast, or to *hug* the land; especially if this word *lay* in Sanscrit, signifies to *cling*, as we have seen it stated in some author, but for which we cannot vouch. If this sense is attached to the word, it proves it closely allied to the L. *ligo*, to bind.

That the sense of throwing, or driving, is contained in this word, is certain from its derivatives. Thus, in Greek, *απελεγω* signifies to select, to collect; and also to reject, to repudiate, and to forbid; which imply throwing, thrusting away.

Now, if throwing, sending, or driving, is the primary sense, then the Latin *lego*, to read, and *lego*, *legare*, to send, are radically the same word; the inflections of the verb being varied, arbitrarily, to designate the distinct applications, just as in *pello*, *appello*, *appellere*, to drive, and *appello*, *appellare*, to call.

And here it may be worth a moment's consideration, whether several words with prefixes, such as *slay*, *flog*, and the Latin *plico*, W. *plygu*, are not formed on the root of *lay*, that is, *lag* or *lak*. The sense of *slay*, Sax. *slagan*, *slean*, is properly to strike, to beat; hence in Saxon, "*Hig slagon heora wedd*," they *slew* their league or contract; that is, they struck a bargain. It signifies also to throw, as to *slay* one into prison; also to fall; to set or lay. The sense of killing is derivative from that of striking, a striking down.

Flog, Lat. *figo*, signifies, primarily, to *rush*, *drive*, *strike*, Eng. to *lick*; and if formed on the root of *lay*, is precisely the popular phrase, to *lay on*.

If *plico* is formed with a prefix on *lay* or its root, it must have been originally *pelico*, that is, *belico*, *belay*. Then to fold, would be to *lay on* or *close*; to lay one part to another. Now this word is the Welsh *plygu*, to fold, which Owen makes to be a compound of *py* and *lly*. The latter word must be a contraction of *llyg*.

We know that the word *reply* is from the French *repliquer*, the Latin *replico*. Now, to *reply*, is not to *fold back*, but to send back, to throw back, as words or an answer; and this

gives the precise sense of *lay*, to throw, to send, which must be the sense of the radical word.

It is no inconsiderable evidence of the truth of our conjecture, that we constantly use the phrase to *lay on*, or *lay to*, as synonymous with *ply*, a word belonging to this family. To *pledge*, another of this family, is to *lay down*, to deposit; and the primary sense of *play*, Saxon *plegan*, Dan. *leger*, Sw. *leka*, is to strike or drive.

In Welsh, *lluçiau* signifies to throw, fling, cast, or dart; to pelt; to drift; from *lluç*, a darting, a flash, glance, or sudden throw; hence *lluçed*, lightning. *Llug* signifies also, that breaks, or begins to open, a gleam, a breaking out in blotches; the plague. *Llug* signifies also, that is apt to break out, that is bright, a tumour, eruption. These words coincide with English *light*, Lat. *luceo*; the primary sense of which is to throw, shoot, or dart; and these words all contain the elements of *flog* and *fling*.

In Welsh, *llycu* signifies to fall flat, to lie extended, or to squat. This is evidently allied to *lay* and *lie*.

These senses agree also with that of *luck*, to fall, or come suddenly; that is, to rush or drive along.

In Russ. *vlagayu* is to lay, or put in; equivalent to the German *einlegen*.

The Latin *fluo* is contracted from *flugo*; and the radical sense of *fluo* is the same as that of *light*. So the river *dar*, in Europe, is doubtless from the same source as the Oriental *דאר* to shine, whence *air*. And *דור* which, in Hebrew, signifies to flow as water, as well as to shine, chiefly signifies in Chaldee and Syriac, to shine.

To show the great importance, or rather the absolute necessity, of ascertaining the primary sense of words, in order to obtain clear ideas of the sense of ancient authors, more particularly of difficult passages in dead languages, let the reader attend to the following remarks.

In commenting on certain parts of Isaiah xxviii. Lowth observes in his Preliminary Dissertation, the difficulty of determining the meaning of *דור* in verse 15th. In our version, as in others, it is rendered *agreement*; but, says Lowth, "the word means no such thing in any part of the Bible, except in the 18th verse following; nor can the lexicographers give any satisfactory account of the word in this sense." Yet he agrees with Vitrina, that in these passages it must have this signification. The difficulty, it seems, has arisen from not understanding the primary sense of *seeing*, for the verb generally signifies to *see*; and as a noun the word signifies sight, vision; and so it is rendered in the Latin version annexed to Vaunderbooght's Bible. The Seventy render it by *συνενα*, a covenant or league; and they are followed by the moderns. "Nous avons *intelligence* avec le sepulchre." French. "Noi habbiam fatta *lega* col sepolcero." Italian of Diodati.

Parkhurst understands the word to signify, to fasten, to settle, and he cites 2 Sam. xx. 9, *דור*. "Joab took Amasa by the beard." Here the sense is obvious; and from this and other passages, we may infer with certainty, that the radical sense is to *reach* to, or to *seize*, *hold*, or *fix*. If the sense is to *reach* to, then it accords with *covenant*, *conveniens*, coming to; if the sense is to *fix*, or fasten, then it agrees with *league*, Lat. *ligo*, and with *pact*, *pactum*, from *pango*, to make fast; all from the sense of extension, stretching, straining. Hence the meaning of *דור* the breast; that is, the firm, fixed, strong part. And if the English *gaze* is the same word, which is not improbable, this determines the appropriate sense of *seeing* in this word, to be to *fix*, or to look or reach with the eye fixed.

But we have other and decisive evidence of the primary signification of this word in the obvious, undisputed meaning of *דור* the same word with a prefix, which signifies to catch, or lay hold on; to seize; hence behind, following, as if attached to; and hence drawing out in time, to delay.

Now it is not improbable that the Arabic *كأ* *kauza*, may be a word of the same stock; and this signifies, among other senses, to collect, contract, or draw together, to accumulate, to have intercourse or commerce with another. The latter sense would give nearly the signification of the Hebrew word. Lexicographers are often embarrassed to account for the

different signification of words that are evidently derived from the same root. Thus, in Hebrew, שָׁרַר is rendered to sing; to look, behold, or observe; and to rule; and its derivatives, a ruler, a wall, the navel-string, a chain, or necklace, &c. How can a word signify to rule, and to sing, and to look? Nothing can be more easy or natural. The sense is, in both cases, to stretch or strain, to reach. To sing is to strain the voice; to rule is to restrain men; and to see is to reach, or to hold in view.

In Latin, *sero* signifies to sow, to plant, to beget, to spread; *consero*, to sow, and to close or join; *desero*, to leave off, to desert; *assero*, to plant by or near, and to assert, affirm, and pronounce; *dissero*, to discourse; *insero*, to insert, to implant; *resero*, to unlock, to open, to disclose. *Desero*, to desert, Ainsworth says, is a compound of *de* and *sero*, "ut sit desertum quod non seritur nec colitur." And *dissero* he supposes must be a metaphorical use of the word. Now, on the principles we have unfolded, nothing is easier than an explanation of these words. The sense of *sero* is to throw, to thrust; its literal sense is applied to sowing and planting; *consero* is to thrust or drive together; *desero* is to throw from; *assero* is to throw in words, or to throw out, as in *appello*; *dissero* is to throw words or arguments, with the sense of spreading, expatiating; *insero* is to throw or thrust in; *resero* is to throw or drive from, hence to unlock or open.

It is by resorting to the primary idea of words, that we are able to explain applications, apparently, or in fact, diverse and even contrary. A very common example of this contrariety occurs in words which signify to guard or defend. For instance, the Latin *arceo* signifies to drive off, and to protect, secure, hold, restrain, or keep from departing or escaping; two senses directly opposite. This is extremely natural; for *arceo* signifies to thrust off, repel, drive back; and this act defends the person or object attacked. Or if we suppose the sense of *straining* to be anterior to that of repulsion, which is not improbable, then the act of straining or holding produces both effects; to repel or stop what advances to assault, and protect what is inclosed or assaulted. The words *guard* and *warren* present a similar application of the primary idea; and all languages which we have examined, furnish a multitude of similar examples.

These examples illustrate the utility of extensive researches in language; as all cognate languages throw light on each other; one language often retaining the radical meaning of a word which the others have lost. Who, for instance, that is acquainted only with the English use of the verb to *have*, would suspect that this word and *happen* are radically one, and that the primary sense is to *fall* or *rush*, hence to fall on and seize? Yet nothing is more certain. In the Spanish language the senses of both verbs are retained in *haber*; and the Welsh *hapiaw* gives us the true original signification.

In like manner the primary sense of *venio* in Latin, cannot be certainly determined, without resorting to other words, and to kindred languages. In Latin, the word signifies to *come* or *arrive*; but in Spanish, *venida*, from *venir*, the Latin *venio*, signifies not only a coming or arrival, but an attack in fencing. *Venio* coincides in origin with the English *find*; Saxon *findan*; German and Dutch *finden*, to find, to fall or light on; Danish *findet*; Swedish *finna*, to find, to discover, to meet, to strike against, [*offenderet*]. The primary sense of *venio*, then, is not merely to come or arrive, but to rush or move with a driving force; and this sense is applicable to *coming* or *going*.

That the primary sense is to fall or rush, we have evidence in the Latin *ventus*, and English *wind*, both from the root of this verb. We have still further evidence in the word *venom*, which in Welsh is *gwenecyn*; *gwen*, white, and *gwyn*, rage, smart, whence *gwynnt*, wind. *Venom* is that which frets or excites a raging pain. Hence we may infer that Latin *venor*, to hunt, to chase, is of the same family; and so is *venia*, leave, or leave to depart, or a departure, a leaving, coinciding in signification with *leave*.

The latter word, *venia*, proves another fact, that the primary sense of *venio* is, in general, to move in any direction, and that the Latin sense, to *come*, is a particular appropriation of that sense.

In ascertaining the primary sense of words, it is often useful or necessary to recur to the derivatives. Thus the

Latin *lædo* is rendered to *hurt*; but, by adverting to *allido*, *elido*, and *collido*, we find that the original signification is to *strike*, *hit*, or *dash* against. *Hurt*, then, is the secondary sense; the effect of the primary action expressed by the verb.

So the Latin *rapio*, to seize, does not give the sense of *rapidus*, rapid; but the sense of the latter proves the primary sense of *rapio* to be to *rush*, and in its application, to rush on and seize.

These examples will be sufficient to show how little the affinities of language have been understood. Men have been generally satisfied with a knowledge of the *appropriate* sense of words, without examining from what visible or physical action, or *primary* sense, that particular application has been derived. Hence the obscurity that still rests on the theory of language. It has been supposed that each word, particularly each verb, has an original specific sense, or application, distinct from every other verb. We find, however, on a close examination and comparison of the same word in different languages, that the fact is directly the reverse; that a verb expressing some action, in a general sense, gives rise to various appropriate senses, or particular applications. And in the course of our researches, we have been struck with the similarity of manner in which different nations have appropriated derivative and figurative senses. For example, all nations, as far as our researches extend, agree in expressing the sense of *justice* and *right*, by *straightness*, and *sin*, *iniquity*, *wrong*, by a deviation from a straight line or course. Equally remarkable is the simplicity of the analogies in language, and the small number of radical significations; so small indeed, that we are persuaded the primary sense of all the verbs in any language, may be expressed by thirty or forty words.

We cannot, at this period of the world, determine, in all cases, which words are primitive, and which are derivative; nor whether the verb or the noun is the original word. Mons. Gebelin, in his *Monde Primitif*, maintains that the noun is the root of all other words. Never was a greater mistake. That some nouns may have been formed before the verbs with which they are connected, is possible; but as languages are now constructed, it is demonstrably certain, that the verb is the radix or stock from which have sprung most of the nouns, adjectives, and other parts of speech belonging to each family. This is the result of all our researches into the origin of languages. We find, indeed, that many modern verbs are formed on nouns; as to *practise* from *practice*; but the noun is derived from a Greek verb. So we use *wrong* as a verb, from the adjective *wrong*; but the latter is primarily a participle of the verb to *wring*. Indeed a large part of all nouns were originally participles or adjectives, and the things which they denote were named from their qualities. So *pard*, *pardus*, is from פָּרַד *barad*, hail; and the animal so named from his spots, as if sprinkled with hail, from the sense of separation or scattering. *Crape*, the Fr. *crêpe*, is from *crêper*, to *crisp*. *Sight* signifies, primarily, seen; it being the participle of *seon*, contracted from *signan*. *Draught* is the participle of *draw*, that which is drawn, or the act of drawing; *thought* is the participle of *think*.

As the verb is the principal radix of other words, and as the proper province of this part of speech is to express *action*, almost all the modifications of the primary sense of the verb may be comprehended in one word, to *move*.

The principal varieties of motion or action, may be expressed by the following verbs.

1. To drive, throw, thrust, send, urge, press.
2. To set, fix, lay. But these are usually from thrusting, or throwing down.
3. To strain, stretch, draw; whence holding, binding, strength, power, and often health.
4. To turn, wind, roll, wander.
5. To flow, to blow, to rush.
6. To open, part, split, separate, remove, scatter. See No. 16.
7. To swell, distend, expand, spread.
8. To stir, shake, agitate, rouse, excite.
9. To shoot, as a plant; to grow; allied to No. 1.
10. To break, or burst; allied sometimes to No. 3.
11. To lift, raise, elevate; allied to No. 9.
12. To flee, withdraw, escape; to fly; often allied to No. 1.

INTRODUCTION.

13. To rage; to burn; allied to Nos. 7 and 8.
14. To fall; to fail; whence fading, dying, &c.
15. To approach, come, arrive, extend, reach. This is usually the sense of *guining*. No. 34.
16. To go, walk, pass, advance; allied to No. 6.
17. To seize, take hold; sometimes allied to No. 31.
18. To strike; to beat; allied to No. 1.
19. To swing, to vibrate. No. 29.
20. To lean; to incline; allied to the sense of wandering, or departing.
21. To rub, scratch, scrape; often connected with driving, and with roughness.
22. To swim; to float.
23. To stop, cease, rest; sometimes at least, from straining, holding, fastening.
24. To creep; to crawl; sometimes connected with scraping.
25. To peel, to strip, whence spoiling.
26. To leap, to spring; allied to Nos. 9 and 1.
27. To bring, bear, carry; in some instances connected with producing, throwing out.
28. To sweep.
29. To hang. No. 19.
30. To shrink, or contract; that is, to draw. See No. 3.
31. To run; to rush forward; allied to No. 1.
32. To put on or together; to unite, allied to Nos. 1 and 3.
33. To knit, to weave.
34. To gain, to win, to get. See No. 15.

These and a few more verbs express the literal sense of all the primary roots. But it must be remarked that all the foregoing significations are not distinct. So far from it, that the whole may be brought under the signification of a very few words. The English words to *send, throw, thrust, strain, stretch, draw, drive, urge, press*, embrace the primary sense of a great part of all the verbs in every language which we have examined. Indeed, it must be so, for the verb is certainly the root of most words; and the verb expresses *motion*, which always implies the application of force.

Even the verbs which signify to hold or *stop*, in most instances at least, if not all, denote, primarily, to strain or restrain by exertion of force: and to *lie* is, primarily, to throw down, to lay one's self down. So that intransitive verbs are rarely exceptions to the general remark above made, that all verbs primarily express motion or exertion of force. The substantive verb has more claims to be an exception than any other; for this usually denotes, we think, permanence or continued being; but the primary sense of this verb may perhaps be to *set* or *fix*; and verbs having this sense often express *extension in time or duration*. So *αἰῶν* in Greek, is to stretch, but the same word *teneo* in Latin, is to hold; hence *continuance*.

Let us now attend to the radical sense of some of the most common verbs.

Speaking, calling, crying, praying, utterance of sounds, is usually from the sense of *driving or straining*. Thus in Latin *appello* and *compello*, though of a different conjugation from *pello, depello, impello*, are from the same root; and although the Latin *repello* does not signify to *recall*, yet the corresponding word in Italian, *rappellare*, and the French *rappeler*, signify to *recall*, and hence the English *repeal*. Hence also *peal*, either of a bell or of thunder. This is the Greek *βαλλω*, and probably *παλλω* is from the same root. The sense of *striking* is found in the Greek verb, and so it is in the Latin *loquor*, English *clock*. But in general, speaking, in all its modifications, is the straining, driving, or impulse of sounds. Sometimes the sense coincides more exactly with that of *breaking or bursting*.

Singing is a driving or straining of the voice: and we apply *strain* to a passage of music, and to a course of speaking.

We are not confident that we can refer the sensation of *hearing* to any visible action. Possibly it may sometimes be from striking, hitting, touching. But we observe that *hear* is connected in origin with *ear*, as the Latin *audio* is with the Greek *αὔω*, the ear; whence it appears probable that the verb to *hear*, is formed from the name of the ear, and the *ear* is from some verb which signifies to shoot or extend, for it signifies a limb.

The primary sense of *seeing*, is commonly to extend to, to reach; as it were, to reach with the eye. Hence the use of *behold*, for the radical sense of *hold* is to strain; and hence its signification in *beholden*, held, bound, obligated. See the verb *SEE* in the Dictionary.

The sense of *look* may be somewhat different from that of *see*. It appears, in some instances, to have for its primary signification, to *send, throw, cast*; that is, to send or cast the eye or sight.

The primary sense of *feeling* is to touch, hit, or strike; and probably this is the sense of *taste*.

Wonder and astonishment are usually expressed by some word that signifies to *stop* or *hold*. Hence the Latin *miror*, to wonder, is the Armoric *miret*, to stop, hold, hinder; coinciding with the English *moor*, and Spanish *anarrar*, to *moor*, as a ship.

To *begin* is to come, or fall on; to thrust on. We have a familiar example in the Latin *incipio, in* and *capio*; for *capio* is primarily to fall or rush on and seize. See *BEGIN* in the Dictionary.

Attempt is expressed by straining, stretching, as in Latin *tentio*. See *ASSAY* and *ESSAY*.

Power, strength, and the corresponding verb, to *be able*, are usually expressed by *straining, stretching*, and this is the radical sense of *ruling or governing*. Of this the Latin *rego* is an example, which gives *reclus, right*, that is, *stretched, straight*.

Care, as has been stated, is usually from *straining*, that is, a *tension* of the mind.

Thinking is expressed by *setting*. To *think* is to set or fix or hold in the mind. It approaches to the sense of *suppose*, Latin *suppono*.

Aud under this word, let us consider the various applications of the Latin *puto*. The simple verb *puto* is rendered to prune, lop, or dress, as vines, that is, according to Ainsworth, *putum, i. e. purum reddo, purgo*, by which we understand him to mean, that *putum* is either a change of *purum*, or used for it; a most improbable supposition, for the radical letters *t* and *r* are not commutable. *Puto* is rendered also, to make even, clear, adjust, or cast up accounts; also to think or consider; to suppose; to debate. Its compounds are *amputo*, to cut off, prune, amputate, to remove; *computo*, to compute, to reckon, to think or deem; *disputo*, to make clear, to adjust, or settle, to dispute, or debate, to reason; *imputo*, to impute, to ascribe or lay to, to place to account; *reputo*, to consider, to revolve, to reckon up, to impute. The Latin *deputo* signifies to think, judge, or esteem, to account or reckon, and to prune; but the Italian *deputare*, Spanish *disputar*, and French *deputer*, from the Latin word, all signify to send. How can the sense of *think*, and that of *lop* or *prune*, be deduced from a common root or radical sense? We find the solution of this question in the verb to *depute*. The primary sense is to throw, thrust, or send, or to set or lay, which is from throwing, driving. To prune is to separate, remove, or drive off; to force off; to *think* is a setting in the mind; to *compute* is to throw or put together, either in the mind or in numbers; to *dispute* is to throw against or apart, like *debate*, to beat from; to *impute* is to throw or put to or on; and to *repute* is to think or throw in the mind repeatedly. To *amputate* is to separate by cutting round. *Puto* then in Latin is from the same root, probably, as the English *put*, or the same word differently applied; and also the Dutch *pooten*, to plant; *poot*, a paw, a twig, or shoot, Gr. *φύρον*, &c.

In attempting to discover the primary sense of words, we are to carry our reflections back to the primitive state of mankind, and consider how rude men would effect their purposes, before the invention or use of the instruments which the moderns employ. The English verb to *cut*, signifies, ordinarily, to separate with an edged tool; and we are apt to consider this as the chief and original sense. But if so, how can *cut*, the stroke of a whip, which is a legitimate sense of the word, be deduced from the act of severing by an edged tool? We have, in this popular use of the word, a clue to guide us to the primary sense, which is, to drive, urge, press, and applied to the arm, to strike. But we have better evidence. In the popular practice of speaking, it is not uncommon to hear one person call to another when running, and say, *Cut on, cut on*;

that is, hurry, run faster, drive, press on; probably from striking a beast which one rides on. This is the original sense of the word. Hence we see that this verb is the Latin *cado*, to strike, to cut down, somewhat differently applied, and *cado*, to fall, is only a modified sense of the same root, and the compounds *incido*, to cut, and *incido*, to fall on, are of one family. To *cut* is, therefore, primarily, to strike, or drive; and to *cut off*, if applied to the severing of bodies, before edged tools were used, was to force off, or to strike off; hence the sense of separating in the phrase to *cut off* a retreat or communication.

So the Latin *carpo* is the English *carne*, originally to separate by plucking, pulling, seizing and tearing, afterwards, by cutting.

Asking is usually expressed by the sense of *pressing, urging*. We have a clear proof of this in the Latin *peto* and its compounds. This verb signifies, primarily, to rush, to drive at, to assault; and this sense, in Dictionaries, ought to stand first in the order of definitions. We have the force of the original in the words *impetus* and *impetuous*. So the Latin *rogo* coincides in elements with *reach*.

The act of *understanding* is expressed by *reaching* or *taking, holding, sustaining*; the sense of *comprehend*, and of *understand*. We have a popular phrase which well expresses this sense, "I take your meaning or your idea." So in German, *begreifen*, to *begrife*, to apprehend.

Knowing seems to have the same radical sense as *understanding*.

Pain, grief, distress, and the like affections, are usually expressed by *pressure* or *straining*. *Affliction* is from *striking*.

Joy, mirth, and the like affections, are from the sense of *rousing, exciting, lively action*.

Covering, and the like actions, are from spreading over or cutting off, interruption.

Hiding is from covering or from withdrawing, departure; or concealment may be from withholding, restraining, suppressing, or making fast, as in the Latin *celo*.

Heat usually implies excitement; but as the effect of heat as well as of cold is sometimes to contract, we think both are sometimes from the same radix. Thus *cold* and the Lat. *caleo*, to be warm, and *callus* and *calleo*, to be hard, have all the same elementary letters, and we suppose them all to be from one root, the sense of which is, to draw, strain, shrink, contract. We are the more inclined to this opinion, for these words coincide with *calleo*, to be strong or able, to know; a sense that implies straining and holding.

Hope is probably from reaching forward. We express strong desire by *longing*, reaching toward.

Earnestness, boldness, daring, peril, promptness, readiness, willingness, love and favour, are expressed by *advancing* or *inclining*.

Light is often expressed by opening, or the shooting of rays, radiation; and probably in many cases, the original word was applied to the dawn of day in the morning. *Whiteness* is often connected in origin with light. We have an instance of this in the Latin *caneo*, to shine and to be white.

And that the primary sense of this word is to shoot, to radiate, that is, to throw out or off, we have evidence in the verb *cano*, to sing, whence *canto*, the sense of which is retained in our popular use of *cant*; to *cant* a stone; to *cant* over a cask; give the thing a *cant*; for all these words are from one stock.

The Latin *virtus*, the English *worth*, is from the root of *vireo*, to grow, that is, to stretch forward, to shoot; hence the original sense is strength, a sense we retain in its application to the qualities of plants. Hence the Latin sense of *virtus* is bravery, coinciding with the sense of *boldness*, a projecting forward.

Pride is from swelling or elevation, the primary sense of some other words nearly allied to it.

Fear is usually from *shrinking* or from *shaking, trembling*; or sometimes, perhaps, from *striking*, a being struck, as with surprise.

Holiness and *sacredness* are sometimes expressed by *separation*, as from common things. The Teutonic word *holy*, however, seems to be from the sense of *soundness, entireness*.

Faith and *belief* seem to imply a resting, or a leaving. It

is certain that the English *belief* is a compound of the prefix *be* and *leaf*, leave, permission. To *believe* one, then, is to leave with him, to rest or suffer to rest with him, and hence not to dispute, contend or deny.

Colour may be from spreading over or putting on; but in some instances the primary sense is to *dip*. See DYE and TINGE.

Spots are from the sense of *separating* or from *sprinkling, dispersion*.

The radical sense of *making* is to press, drive, or force. We use *make* in its true literal sense, in the phrases, *Make your horse draw, Make your servant do what you wish*.

Feeding is from the sense of *pressing, crowding, stuffing*, that is, from *driving* or *thrusting*. *Eating* seems to have a somewhat different sense.

Drinking is from *drawing*, or from wetting, plunging. *Drench* and *drink* are radically one word.

Anger, and the like violent passions, imply excitement, or violent action. Hence their connection with *burning* or *inflammation*, the usual sense of which is *raging* or *violent commotion*.

Agreement, harmony, are usually from meeting, or union, or from extending, reaching to.

Dwelling, abiding are from the sense of throwing or setting down, or resting, or from stretching; as we see by the Latin *continuo*, from *teneo*, Gr. *τινω*, to extend.

Guarding and *defending* are from roots that signify to stop, or to cut off; or more generally, from the sense of *driving off*, a repelling or striking back. In some cases perhaps from holding.

Opposition is usually expressed by meeting, and hence the prepositions which express opposition. Thus the Danish preposition *mod*, Swedish *mot* or *emot*, against, contrary, is the English word to *meet*.

Words which express *spirit*, denote, primarily, *breath, air, wind*, the radical sense of which is to flow, move or rush. Hence the connection between *spirit* and *courage, animus, animosus*; hence passion, *animosity*. So in Greek *φρενις*, frenzy, is from *φην*, the mind, or rather from its primary sense, a moving or rushing.

So in our mother tongue, *mod* is mind or spirit; whence *mood*, in English, and Saxon *modig*, moody, angry. Hence *mind* in the sense of *purpose*, its primary signification is a setting forward, as *intention* is from *intendo*, to stretch, to strain, the sense that ought to stand first in a Dictionary.

Reproach, chiding, rebuke, are from the sense of scolding, or throwing out words with violence.

Sin is generally from the sense of deviating, wandering, as is the practice of lewdness.

Right, justice, equity, are from the sense of stretching, making straight, or from laying, making smooth.

Falsehood is from *falling, failing*, or from deviation, wandering, drawing aside.

The primary sense of *strange* and *foreign*, is distant, and from some verb signifying to depart. *Wild* and *fierce* are from a like sense.

Vain, vanity, wane, and kindred words, are from *exhaust, ing, drawing out*, or from *departing, withdrawing, falling away*.

Paleness is usually from *failure*, a departure of colour.

Glory is from opening, expanding, display, or making clear.

Binding, making fast or close, is from pressure, or straining. *Writing* is from scratching, engraving, the sense of all primitive words which express this act.

A *crowd*, a *mass*, a *wood*, &c., are from collecting or pressing, or some allied signification.

Vapour, steam, smoke, are usually from verbs which signify to exhale or throw off.

Stepping seems to be from opening, expanding, stretching. Thus *passus* in Latin is from *pando*, to open, but this agrees in origin with *pateo*, and with the Greek *πατω*. *Gradus* in Latin coincides with the Welsh *rhawd*, a way, and this, when traced to its root, terminates in the Oriental *ܚܕܐ* Chaldee, to open, stretch or expand; in Syriac, *ܚܕܐ* *radah*, to go, to pass. Walking may be sometimes from a like source; but

the word *walk* signifies, primarily, to roll, press, work and full as a hat, whence *walker* signifies a fuller.

Softness and *weakness* are usually named from *yielding*, *bending*, *withdrawing*, as is relaxation. Softness, however, is sometimes connected with smoothness, and perhaps with moisture.

Sweetness seems to have for its primary sense, either softness or smoothness.

Roughness is from sharp points, wrinkling or breaking; and *acidity* is from sharpness or pungency, and nearly allied to roughness.

Death is expressed by falling or departure; *life*, by fixedness or continuance, or from animation, excitement.

Selling is, primarily, a passing or transfer. *Sellan* in Saxon, signifies to give, as well as to sell.

A *coast* or *border* is usually the extreme point, from extending.

Law is from setting, establishing.

The primary sense of son, daughter, offspring, is usually a *shoot*, or as we say, *issue*. Hence in Hebrew בן *ben*, signifies both a son, a scion, a branch, and the young of other animals. A son, says Parkhurst, is from בנה *banah*, to build; and hence he infers that a son is so called, because he builds up or continues his father's house or family. But if so, how does the word apply to a branch, or an arrow? What do these build up? The mistake of this author, and of others, proceeds from their not understanding the original meaning of the verb, which is *not to erect*, or *elevate*, but to throw, to set, to found; and this verb is probably retained in our word *found*. A son is that which is thrown or shot out; a scion or branch is the same, an *offset*, one an *offset* of the human body, the other of a plant, and an arrow is that which is shot or thrown. Hence, probably, the Hebrew עֵבֶן *eben* or *even*, a stone, W. *maen* or *vaen*, that which is set, so named from its compactness or

hardness. And in Arabic عَبَان *abana*, signifies to think, Lat. *opino*, that is, to set in the mind.

Few and *small* are senses often expressed by the same word. Thus, although *few* in English expresses merely a small number, yet the same word in French, *peu*, and in the Italian, *poco*, signifies little in quantity, as well as few in number.

Cause is from the sense of *urging*, *pressing*, *impelling*. Hence it well expresses that which produces an effect; and hence it is peculiarly expressive of that by which a man seeks to obtain a claim in law. A *cause* in court is properly a *pressing for right*, like *action* from *ago*; and *prosecution* from the Latin *sequor*, which is our word *seek*. Hence the Latin *accuso*, to *accuse*, to throw upon, to press or load with a charge. The Saxon *saca*, contention, suit in law, is synonymous with *cause*, and from the root of *seek*, *sequor*. It is the English *sake*.

The word *thing* is nearly synonymous with *cause* and *sake*. See *THING* in the Dictionary.

The primary sense of *time*, *luck*, *chance*, *fortune*, is to fall, to come, to arrive, to happen. *Tide*, *time* and *season*, have a like original sense. *Tide*, in Saxon, is *time*, not a flow of the sea, the latter being a secondary and modern application of the word. This primary signification of time will unfold to us why the Latin *tempora* should signify *times* and the *temples*. It seems that *tempora* are the *falls* of the head. Hence, also, we understand why *tempest* is naturally deducible from *tempus*, as the primary sense is to fall, to rush. Hence *tempestivus*, seasonable, that comes in good time. *Season* has a like sense.

Hence, also, we are led to understand, what has seemed inexplicable, how the French *heureux*, lucky, happy, can be regularly deduced from *heure*, an hour. We find that in Greek and Latin the primary sense of *hour* is *time*, and *time* is a coming, a falling, a happening, like the English *luck*, and hence the sense of lucky; hence fortunate and happy. The word *fortunate* is precisely of the same character.

The primary sense of the Shemitic דָּעַר *davar*, or *thavar*, corresponds almost precisely with that of *cause* and *thing* in English, that is, to strain, urge, drive, fall or rush. Hence it signifies to speak, and in Ch. and Syr. to lead, to direct, to govern. As a noun, it signifies a word, that which is uttered; a thing, cause or matter, that is, that which happens or falls,

like *event* from *evenio*; also a plague, or great calamity, that is, that which falls or comes on man or beast, like *plague*, a stroke or *affliction*, from striking. And it may be observed, that if the first letter is a prefix answering to the Gothic *du*, Saxon and English *to*, in the Saxon *to-drifan*, to drive, then the root דָּר coincides exactly with the Welsh *peri*, to command, which is retained in composition in the Lat. *impero*. Indeed if the first syllable of *guberno* is a prefix, the root of this word may be the same. The object, however, for which this word is here mentioned, is chiefly to show the uniformity which men have observed in expressing their ideas; making use of the same visible physical action to represent the operations of the mind and moral ideas.

Silence, *deafness*, *dumbness*, are from *stopping*, *holding*, or *making fast*.

War is from the sense of *striving*, *driving*, *struggling*.

Good is generally from *enlarging*, or *advancing*, like *prosperous*.

Evil is from wandering, departing, or sometimes from softness, weakness, flowing or fluxibility, as is the case with the Latin *malum*, from the Welsh *mall*.

The primary sense of the names of natural and material objects cannot always be ascertained. The reasons are obvious. Some of these names are detached branches of a family of words which no longer form a part of our language; the verb and all the derivatives, except a single name, being extinct, or found only in some remote country. Others of these names have suffered such changes of orthography, that it is difficult or impossible to ascertain the primary or radical letters, and of course the family to which they belong. Numerous examples of such words occur in English, as in every other language.

But from such facts as have occurred to us in our researches, we may venture to affirm with confidence, that most names of natural objects are taken from some obvious quality or action, or some supposed quality of the thing; or from the particular action or operation by which it is produced. Thus *tumours* are named from *pushing*, or *swelling*; and *redness*, or *red*, seems, in some instances at least, to be named from *eruptions* on the body. The human body is named from *shaping*, that is, *setting*, *firing*, or *extending*, and hence sometimes, the general name of the human race. The arm is a *shoot*, a *push*, as is the branch of a tree. A board, a table, a floor, is from *spreading*, or *expanding*, *extending*. Skin and bark are from *peeling*, *stripping*, &c.

The names of particular animals and plants cannot always be traced to their source; but as far as we have been able to discover their origin, we find animals to be generally named from some striking characteristic of external appearance, from the voice, from habits of life, or from their office. There is reason for believing that the Greek *argyros* and Latin *struthio*, or ostrich, is from the same root as the English *strut*, the strutter; the primary sense of which root is, to stretch, which explains all the senses of the Greek and Latin words of this family. It is certain that the *crow* is named from its cry, and the *leopard* from his spots.

Thus plants were named from their qualities: some from their form, others from their colour, others from their effects, others from the place of their growth. The English *root*, Lat. *radix*, is only a particular application of *rod* and *ray*, *radius*; that is, a shoot. *Spurge* is, undoubtedly, from the root of the Latin *purgo*.

There is reason to think that many names of plants were originally adjectives, expressing their qualities, or the name was a compound, used for the same purpose, one part of which has been dropped, and the other remaining as the name of the plant. Thus *pine*, *pinus*, is from *pin*, *pinna*, *penna*; for in Welsh *pin* is a *pin* and a *pen* or style for writing; and *pinbren* is a pine-tree. The tree then was named from its leaf.

Fir has a similar origin and signification.

It is probable or rather certain that some natural objects, as plants and minerals, received their names from their *supposed* qualities; as in ages of ignorance and superstition, men might ascribe effects to them, by mistake. The whole history of magic and enchantment leads us to this conclusion.

Minerals are, in many instances, named from their obvious qualities, as *gold* from its yellowness, and *iron* from its hard-

ness. The names can, in some cases, be traced to their original, as that of *gold* and of the Latin *ferrum*; but many of them are not easily ascertained. Indeed, the greatest part of the specific names of animals, plants, and minerals, appear to be obscure. Some of them appear to have no connection with any family of words in our language, and many of them are derived to us from Asia, and from roots which can be found only, if found at all, in the Asiatic languages.

These observations and explanations will be sufficient to show the importance of developing, as far as possible, the origin of words, and of comparing the different uses of the same word in different languages, in order to understand either the philosophy of speech, or the real force and signification of words in their practical application.

If it should be found to be true, that many of the Shemitic verbs are formed with prefixes, like those of the European languages, this may lead to new illustrations of the original languages of the Scriptures. In order to determine this fact, it will be useful to examine whether the Chaldee and Hebrew \aleph is not often a prefix answering to *be* in the Teutonic languages; whether \beth and \daleth are not prefixes answering to the *ga* and *ge* of the Gothic and Teutonic; whether γ , υ and ρ , and τ , a dialectical form of υ , do not coincide with the Gothic *du*, the Saxon *to*, the Dutch *toe*, and the German *zu*; whether σ does not answer to the Russ. and Dutch *na*, the German *nach*; and whether κ and ψ do not answer to *s*, *sh*, and *sch* in the modern English and German.

If many of the Shemitic trilateral verbs are compound, it follows that the primary radix has not been detected. At any rate, we have no hesitation in affirming that the primary sense of many of the roots in the Shemitic languages, that sense which is almost indispensable to an understanding of many obscure passages in the Scriptures, has been hitherto overlooked or mistaken. In order fully to comprehend many uses of the words, it will be necessary to compare them with the uses of the words of the same family in the modern languages, and this comparison must be far more extensive than any hitherto made, and conducted on principles which have not been before duly appreciated and applied.

We have introduced the foregoing comparative view of the several significations of the same word in different languages, not merely to illustrate the general principles of language, but with a special reference to an explanation of the etymologies which occur in this work.

The results of the foregoing remarks and illustrations may be thus recapitulated.

1. The nations which now constitute the distinct families or races of Japheth and Shem, are descendants of the common family which inhabited the plain of Shinar before the dispersion.

2. The families at the dispersion retained a large proportion of the words which were in common use before that event, and the same were conveyed to their posterity. In the course of time, some of these words were dropped by one family or tribe, and some by another, till very few of them are retained in their original form and signification, by all the nations which have sprung from the main stock. A few of them, however, are still found in all or nearly all the languages which we have examined, bearing nearly the same signification and easily recognized as identical.

3. Although few of the primitive words can now be recognized as existing in *all* the languages, yet as we better understand the changes which have been made in the orthography and signification of the same radical words, the more affinities are discovered; and particularly, when we understand the *primary* sense, we find this to unite words whose *appropriate* or *customary* significations appear to have no connection.

4. A great number of the primitive radical words are found in compounds, formed in different languages, with different affixes and prefixes, which obscure the affinity. Thus *veritas* in Latin, is *wahrheit* in German; the first syllable in each is the same word, the last different. In other instances, both difference of orthography, of formation and of application, concur to obscure the affinity of words. Thus, the English word *strong* is in Danish *stremg*, signifying stern, severe, rigid, strict; and *strengthed*, [stronghood,] is severity, rigour, strict-

ness. Now *n* in these words is not radical; remove this letter and we have *strog*, *streg*, which coincide with the Latin *stringo*, *strictus*; and these words are found to be from the same radix, which signifies to draw, to strain, to stretch.

5. It appears that *b*, *p*, and *f* are often prefixes, either the remains of prepositions, or casual additions to words, introduced by peculiar modes of pronunciation, which prefixes now precede consonants, with which they readily coalesce in pronunciation, as *l* and *r*, forming trilateral words on biliteral roots; as in *block* from *lloc*, or *lock*; *play*, Saxon *plegan*, from *leg* or *lek*, Swedish *leka*, Dan. *leger*; *flow*, Lat. *fluo*, from *lug*, or *luc*, which appears in *light*, *lux*, *luceo*, and in *lug*, a river, retained in *Lugdunum*.

6. It appears also, that *c* or *k* and *g*, are often prefixes before the same consonants, *l* and *r*, as in Lat. *clunis*, Eng. *loin*; W. *clod*, praise, from *lod*, Latin *laus*, *laudo*; German *gluck*, English *luck*; Lat. *gratia*, W. *rhad*.

7. It appears also, that *s* is a prefix in a vast number of words, as in *speed*, *spoil*, *swell*, *sweep*; and it is very evident that *st* are prefixed to many words whose original, radical, initial consonant was *r*, as in *straight*, *strict*, *strong*, *stretch*, from the root of *right*, *rectus*, *reach*, and in *stride*, from the root of the Latin *gradior*, W. *rhaz*.

If these inferences are just, as we are persuaded they are, it follows that there is a more near resemblance and a much closer affinity between the languages of Europe and of Western Asia, than has hitherto been supposed to exist. It follows also, that some of the most important principles or rudiments of language have hitherto escaped observation, and that philology is yet in its infancy. Should this prove, on further examination, to be the state of philology, it is reserved for future investigators to examine the original languages of the Scriptures on new principles, which may serve to illustrate some obscure and difficult passages, not hitherto explained to the general satisfaction of critics and commentators.

PROGRESS AND CHANGES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

It has been already observed that the mother tongue of the English is the Anglo-Saxon. The following are specimens of that language as it was spoken or written in England before the Norman conquest. The first is from the Saxon Chronicle. The original is in one column, and the literal translation in the other. The English words in italics are Saxon words. The number of these will show how large a proportion of the words is retained in the present English.

An. DCCCXCI. Her for se here east, and Earnulf cuning gefeah with thæm ræde-here ær tha scipu comon, mid East-Francum, and Seaxum, and Bægum, and hine geflymde. And thry Scottas cwomon to Ælfrede cuninge on anum bate, butan ælcum gerethum, of Hibernia; and thouon hi hi bestælon, forthon the hi woldon for Godes lufan on eltheodnesse bion, by we rohton hwar.

An. 891. Here [this year] fured the army east, and Earnulf, the king, fought with the cavalry [ride army] ere the ships came, with the East-Francs, and Saxons, and Bavarians, and put them to flight. And three Scots come to Ælfred, the king, in a [an] boat, without any rowers, from Hibernia, and thence they privately withdrew [bestole] because that they would, for God's love be [or live] in a state of pilgrimage, they should not be anxious—[reck, care] where.

Se bat was geworht of thriddan healfre lyde, the hie on foron, and hi namon mid him that hie hufdon to seofon nihtum mete, and tha comon hie ymb seofon niht, to londre on Cornwealun, and foran tha sona to Ælfrede cuninge.

The boat was wrought of two hides and a half [third half hide,] in which they took with them that they had for seven nights meat, and they come about the seventh night, to land in Cornwall, and fared [went] soon to Ælfred, the king.

The following specimen is from the Anglo-Saxon version of Orosius, supposed to be made by King Ælfred.

Ohthere sæde his hlaforde,
 Ælfrède kyninge, thæt he ealra
 North-manna north mest bude.
 He cwæth that he bude on
 them lande northewearðum
 with tha west sæ. He sæde
 theah thæt thæt land sy
 swythe north thanon; ac hit
 is eall west buton on feawum
 stowum stice mælum wiciath
 Finnas, on huntathe on wintra,
 and on sumera on fiscothe be
 there sæ. He sæde thæt he
 set sumum cyrre wolde fandiam
 hu lange thæt land north right
 læge.

Oethere told [said] his lord,
king Alfred, that he lived
north most of all the north
men. He quoth that he dwelt
in the [them] land northward,
opposite [with] the west sea.
He said though, that that land
is due north from thence, and
that it is all waste except
[but] in a few places [stows]
where the Finns for the most
part dwell, for hunting in
winter, and in summer for
fishing in that sea, [by the
sea.] He said that he, at
some time, would find how
long that land lay right north.

LAWS OF KING ÆTHELBERT.

Gif Cyning his leode to
 him gehatah, and heom mon
 thær yfel gedo, II bote and
 cyning L. scillinga.

If the King shall call [cite]
 his people to him, and any
 one [man] shall there do evil,
 let double compensation be
 made, and fifty shillings to the
 King.

Gif in Cyninges tune man
 mannan ofsleah, L. scill.
 gebete.

If in the King's town a
 man slay a man, let him
 compensate [boot] with fifty
 shillings.

Gif on Eorles tune man
 mannan ofsleath, XII scil.
 gebete.

If in an Earl's town one
 man slayeth another man, let
 him pay twelve shillings for
 reparation.

Gif man thone man ofslethh,
 XX scil. gebete.

If man [any one] slayeth
 any man, let him compensate
 with twenty shillings.

Gif thuman (of a slæthth)
 XX scil. Gif thuman nigel
 of weordeth III scil. gebete.
 Gif man scyfeþing (of a
 slæthth.) VIII scil. gebete.
 Gif man middle finger (of
 a slæthth.) IV scil. gebete.
 Gif man gold-finger (of a
 slæthth.) VI scil. gebete. Gif
 man thon litan finger (of a
 slæthth) XI scil. gebete.

If the thumb shall be cut
 off, twenty shillings. If the
 thumb nail shall be cut off,
 three shillings shall be the
 compensation. If any one
 [off slayeth, striketh off,]
 cutteth off the fore finger,
 [shoot finger,] let him com-
 pensate with eight shillings.
 If any one cutteth off the
 middle finger, let him pay
 four shillings. If any one
 cutteth off the gold finger,
 [ring finger,] let him pay six
 shillings. If any one cutteth
 off the little finger, let him
 pay eleven shillings.

LAWS OF KING EADGAR.

We læraht that ælc cristen
 man his bearn to cristen dome
 geornlice wænige and him
 pater noster and credon tæce.

We order (or instruct) that
 each christian man earnestly
 accustom [wean] his children
 to christianity, [Christendom,]
 and teach him the Pater Noster
 and Creed.

We læraht that preost ne
 heo hunta ne hæfeere ne
 tæfere; ac plegge on his
 bocum swa his hade gebirath.

We direct that a priest be
 not a hunter, nor hawkier, nor
 a gamester; but that he apply
 to his books, as it becomes his
 order.

We observe by these extracts that rather more than half the
 Saxon words have been lost, and now form no part of our
 language.

This language, with some words introduced by the Danes,
 continued to be used by the English till the Norman Conquest.
 After that event, great numbers of Saxon words went into
 disuse, not suddenly, but gradually, and French and Latin
 words were continually added to the language, till it began to
 assume its present form, in the fourteenth and fifteenth cen-
 turies. Yet the writings of Gower and Chaucer cannot now be
 fully understood without a glossary.

But it was not in the loss of native Saxon words and the
 accession of French and Latin words alone, that the change of
 our language consisted. Most important alterations were
 made in the sounds of the vowels. It is probable, if not
 certain, that our first vowel *a* had usually or always the broad
 sound, as we now pronounce it in *fall*, or in some words
 perhaps the Italian sound, as it is now called, and as we pro-
 nounce it in *ask*. The sound of *e* was probably nearly the
 same as it is in French and Italian, and in the northern
 languages on the continent of Europe; which is nearly that of
a in *favour*. The Saxon sound of *i* was probably the same as
 it is still on the Continent, the sound of *ee* or long *e*. The
 sound of *u* was that of our present *oo*, French *ou*, the sound it
 still has in Italian, and in most countries on the European
 continent. It is probable that the change of the sound of *u*
 happened in consequence of the prevalence of the French pro-
 nunciation after the Conquest; for the present sound of *u* may
 be considered as intermediate, between the full sound of *oo*, or
 French *ou*, and the French sound of *u*.

These changes, and the various sounds given to the same
 character, now serve to perplex foreigners, when learning
 English; and tend, in no small degree, to retard or limit the
 extension of our language. This is an unfortunate circum-
 stance, not only in obstructing the progress of science, but of
 Christianity.

The principal changes in the articulations are the use of *k*
 for *c*, as in *look* for *locian*; the loss of *h* before *l*, as in *loaf*
 from *hlaef*, *lot* for *hlot*, *lean* for *hlinian*; and the entire loss
 of the prefix *ge* or *ga*, as in *deal* for *ge-dælan*, *deem* for *ge-
 deman*; and of *to* as a prefix, as in *to-helpian*, to help; *to-
 dailan*, to deal. In no instance do we feel more sensibly the
 change of sounds in the vowels, than in that of *i*, which in
 French, Spanish, and Italian, is *e* long; for in consequence of
 this, persons who are not acquainted with these foreign lan-
 guages, mispronounce such words as *marino*, *Messina*, *Lima*,
 giving to *i* its English sound, when in fact the words are to be
 pronounced *mareeno*, *Messeena*, *Leema*.

In grammatical structure the language has suffered consider-
 able alterations. In our mother tongue, nouns were varied to
 form cases, somewhat as in Latin. This declension of nouns
 has entirely ceased, except in the possessive or genitive case, in
 which an apostrophe before *s* has been substituted for the
 regular Saxon termination *es*. Some of our pronouns retain
 their declensions, somewhat varied. The plural termination in
en has been dropped, in a number of words, and the regular
 plural termination been substituted, as *houses* for *housen*.

In most cases, the Saxon termination of the infinitive mode
 of verbs has been dropped, and for *gifan* we now write, *to*
give. The variations of the verb, in the several persons, have
 been materially changed. Thus for the Saxon—

Ic lufige,
 Thu lufast,
 He lufath.

We lufiath,
 Ge lufiast,
 Hi lufiath.

we now write—

I love,
 Thou lovest,
 He loveth or loves.

We love,
 Ye love,
 They love.

In the Saxon plural, however, we see the origin of the vul-
 gar practice, still retained in some parts of England. *We*
loves, they loves, which are contractions of *lufiath*.

In the substantive verb, our common people universally, and
 most persons of better education, unless they have rejected
 their traditional language, retain the Gothic dialect, in the
 past tense.

I was,
 Thou wast,
 He was.

We was,
 Ye was,
 They was.

However people may be ridiculed for this language, it is of genuine origin, as old as the Saxon word *were*. In Gothic the past tense runs thus—

Ik was,	Weis wesum,
Thu wast,	Yus weauth,
Is was,	Eis wesun.*

In the present tense of the substantive verb, our common people use *d'nt*, as in this phrase: "he *d'nt* present." This is evidently a contraction of the Swedish and Danish *är*, *er*, present indicative singular of the substantive verb *vara* or *verer*, to be, which we retain in *are* and *were*. In Swedish, *han är*, and in Danish, *han er*, he is. Hence he *er* not or *ar* not, contracted into he *d'nt* or *e'nt*.

These facts serve to show how far the Gothic dialect has been infused into the English language.

It would be tedious, and to most readers uninteresting, to recite all the changes in the forms of words or the structure of sentences which have taken place since the Norman conquest. Since the invention of printing, changes in the language have been less rapid than before; but no art nor effort can completely arrest alterations in a living language. The distinguished writers in the age of Queen Elizabeth improved the language, but could not give it stability. Many words then in common use are now obsolete, or have suffered a change of signification. In the period between Queen Elizabeth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, the language was improved in grammar, orthography, and style. The writers in the reign of Queen Anne and of George I. brought the language nearly to perfection; and if any improvement has since been made, it is in the style or diction, by a better selection of words, and the use of terms in science and philosophy with more precision.

In regard to grammatical construction, the language, for half a century past, has, in our apprehension, been suffering deterioration, at least as far as regards its written form. This change may be attributed chiefly to the influence of the learned Bishop Lowth, whose Grammar made its appearance nearly seventy years ago. We refer particularly to his form of the verb, which was adjusted to the practice of writers in the age of Queen Elizabeth, instead of the practice of authors in the age of William and Mary, Queen Anne, and George I. Hence he gives for the form of the verb in the subjunctive mood, after the words which express a condition, *if, though, &c. I love, thou love, he love*, observing in a note, that in the subjunctive mood, the event being spoken of under a condition or supposition, or in the form of a wish, and therefore doubtful and contingent, the verb itself in the present, and the auxiliary both of the present and past imperfect times, often carry with them somewhat of a future sense; as, "If he come to-morrow, I may speak to him"—"If he should come, I should speak to him." This is true; but for that very reason, this form of the verb belongs to the future tense, or should be arranged as such in Grammars. *If he come*, would be in Latin *si venerit*, in the subjunctive future.

But the learned author has entirely overlooked the important distinction between an event or fact, of uncertain existence in the *present* time, and which is mentioned under the condition of *present* existence, and a *future* contingent event. "If the mail that has arrived *contains* a letter for me, I shall soon receive it," is a phrase that refers to the present time, and expresses an uncertainty in my mind, respecting the fact. "If the mail *contain* a letter for me," refers to a future time, that is, "If the mail of to-morrow *contain* [shall or should contain] a letter for me." The first event, conditional or hypothetical, should be expressed by the indicative mood, and the latter by the subjunctive future. The Saxon form of the verb, *if he slay, if he go*, is evidently a contingent future, and is so used in the laws.

This distinction, one of the most important in the language, has been so totally overlooked, that no provision has been

* This is probably the Latin *esse*. The Latins dropped the first articulation *e*, which answers to our *we*.

The present tense, indicative mood, of the Latin verb, with the *e* restored, would be written thus—

Ego vesum,	Nos vesumus, [was.]
Tu res,	Vos vestis, [was.]
Ille vest.	Illi vesunt, [was.]

made for it in English Grammars: nor is the distinction expressed by the form of the verb, as used by a great part of the best writers. On the other hand they continually use one form of the verb to express both senses. The fact is the same in the common version of the Scriptures. *If he go, if he speak*, sometimes express a present conditional tense, and sometimes a contingent future. In general this subjunctive form of the verb in Scripture, expresses future time. "If he thus *say*, I have no delight in thee," expresses a future contingent event; 2 Sam. xv. 26. "If iniquity *be* in thine hand, put it far away," expresses a fact, under a condition, in the present time; Job xi. 14.

In many instances the translators have deviated from the original, in using the subjunctive form of the English verb to express what in Greek is expressed in the indicative. Thus Matthew iv. 6. *Εἰ υἱός ἐστις τοῦ Θεοῦ*, If thou *be* [art] the son of God.

Ch. v. 29 and 30. *Εἰ δι' ὀφθαλμοῦ σου ἰδεῖς σκανδαλίζειν σε*, If thy right eye *offend* [offendeth thee]; *Εἰ ἡ δεξιὰ σου χυβε σκανδαλίζει σε*, If thy right hand *offend* [offendeth] thee.

So also in chapter xviii. 8 and 9.

Ch. xii. 26. *Εἰ ὁ Σατανὰς τὸν Σατανὰν ἐμβαλεῖ*, If Satan *cast* [casteth] out Satan.

Ch. xix. 10. *Εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετα τῆς γυναικός*, If the case of the man *be* [is] so with his wife.

Ch. xxii. 45. *Εἰ οὖν Δαβὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν Κύριον*, If David then *call* [calleth] him Lord.

2 Cor. iv. 16. *Εἰ οὐκ ἔμνη ἀνθρώπου διαφθείρεται*, Though our outward man *perish* [perishes, or is perishing].

In all these passages, the English verb, in the subjunctive, properly expresses a conditional, contingent or hypothetical future tense, contrary to the sense of the original, except in the last passage cited, where the apostle evidently speaks of the perishing of the outward man as a fact admitted, which renders the translation still more improper.

Let us now attend to the following passages.

Matthew vii. 9. *Ὁ τις ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀνθρώπος, ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον*, Or what man is there of you, whom if his son *ask* [shall ask] bread, *will* he give him a stone?

Καὶ ἐὰν ἰχθὺν αἰτήσῃ, If he *ask* [shall ask] a fish, *will* he give him a serpent?

Here the original tense is varied to express a future or hypothetical event, yet the verb in English is in the same tense as in the first class of examples; and what renders the version more objectionable is, that the verb in the first clause does not correspond with that in the second clause. There is no possible way of making good English of the translation, but by supposing the verb in the first clause *ask*, to be in the future tense. So it would be in Latin, and so it is, "*si petierit*." If thy son shall ask (or should ask) a fish, will he give (or would he give) him a serpent?

This fault runs through the whole English version of the Scriptures, and a distinction of tenses clearly marked in the original languages, is generally neglected in the translation.

1 Tim. v. 4. *Εἰ δι' τῆς χήρας τιμὴν ἡ ἐκγόνα ἰχθὺν*, If any widow *have* [has] children or nephews.

Verse 8. *Εἰ δὲ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μαλίστα τῶν οικίῳ ἐν προίῳ*, If any *provide* [provideth] not for his own, and especially for those of his own house.

This subjunctive form of the verb, *if he be; if he have; if he go; if he say; if thou write; whether thou see; though he fall*, which was generally used by the writers of the sixteenth century, was in a great measure discarded before the time of Addison. Whether this change was in consequence of the prevalence of colloquial usage over grammar rules, or because discerning men perceived the impropriety and inconsistency of the language of books, I pretend not to determine. Certain it is, that Locke, Watts, Addison, Pope, and other authors of the first distinction, who adorned the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century, generally used the indicative mood to express condition, uncertainty, and hypothesis in the present and past tenses. Thus Locke writes—"If these two prepositions *are* by nature imprinted." "If principles *are* innate." "If any person *hath* never examined this notion." "Whether that substance *thinks* or no." "If the soul *doth* think in sleep." "If one *considers* well these men's way of speaking." "If he *does* not reflect." "Unless

that notion *produces* a constant train of successive ideas." "If your lordship *means*." Such is the language of *Locke*.

Now, what is remarkable, the learned Dr. Lowth, the very author who has, by his Grammar, done much to sanction the subjunctive form of the verb, in such cases, often uses the indicative in his own writings. "If he *does* not carefully attend to this—if this pleasure *arises* from the shape of the composition—if this is not firmly and well established." These verbs are in contradiction of his own principles.

On *Isaiah. Prelim. Diss.*

Addison. "If the reader *has* a mind to see a father of the same stamp." "If exercise *throws* off all superfluities—if it *clears* the vessels—if it *dissipates* a growing distemper." Such is the language of Addison, the most elegant writer of the genuine English idiom in the nation.

"If the thief is poor—if it *obliges* me to be conversant with scenes of wretchedness."

"If America is not to be conquered."

Lord Chatham.

"If we *are* to be satisfied with assertions." "If it *gives* blind confidence to any executive government." "If such an opinion *has* gone forth." "If our conduct *has* been marked with vigour and wisdom."

For.

"If my bodily strength is equal to the task." "A negro, if he *works* for himself and not for a master, will do double the work." "If there is any aggravation of our guilt." "If their conduct *displays* no true wisdom." "The honourable gentleman may, if he *chooses*, have the journals read again." "Whether this is a sufficient tie to unite them." "If this measure *comes* recommended." "If there *exists* a country which contains the means of protection."

Pitt

"If the prudence of reserve and decorum *dictates* silence." "If an assembly is viciously or feebly composed." "If any persons *are* to make good deficiencies." "If the King of the French *has* really deserved these murderous attempts." "If this representation of M. Necker *was* false." "Whether the system, if it *deserves* the name." "The politician looks for a power that our workmen call a *purchase*, and if he *finds* the power." "If he *feels* as men commonly feel."

Burke.

"If climate *has* such an effect on mankind." "If the effects of climate *are* casual."

Coze's Russ.

"If he *finds* his collection too small." "If he *thinks* his judgment not sufficiently enlightened." "Whether it *leads* to truth." "If he *warns* others against his own failings." This is generally the language of *Johnson*.

In regard to this distinguished author, we would observe that, except the substantive verb, there is in his Rambler but a single instance of the subjunctive form of the verb in conditional sentences. In all other cases the use of the indicative is uniform.

But neither the authors here mentioned, nor most others, even the most distinguished for erudition, are uniform and consistent with themselves in the use of the tenses. In one sentence we find the indicative used, "If it *is* to be discovered only by the experiment." "If other indications *are* to be found." In the next sentence, "If to miscarry in an attempt *be* a proof of having mistaken the direction of genius." *Johnson*.

"If the former *be* refined—if those virtues *are* accompanied with equal abilities."

Gibbon.

"If love *reward* him, or if vengeance *strike*."

Cowper.

"Or if it *does* not brand him to the last."

Id.

"If he *is* a pagan—if endeavours *are* used—if the person *hath* a liberal education—if man *be* subject to these miseries."

Milner.

The following expressions occur in Pope's Preface to Homer's Iliad, in the compass of thirteen lines.

"If he *has* given a regular catalogue of an army."

"If he *has* funeral games for Patroclus."

"If Ulysses *visit* the shades."

"If he *be* detained from his return."

"If Achilles *be* absent."

"If he *gives* his hero a suit of celestial armour."

We recollect one English author only, who has been careful to avoid this inconsistency; this is Gregory, who, in his *Economy of Nature*, has uniformly used the indicative form of the verb in conditional sentences of this kind.

The propriety of using the indicative form of the verb to express a present or past event conditionally, does not rest

solely on usage; it is most correct upon principle. It is well known that most of the words which are used to introduce a condition or hypothesis, and called, most improperly, conjunctions, *are verbs*, having not the least affinity to the class of words used to connect sentences. *If* is the Saxon *gif*, *give*, having lost its first letter; *if* for the ancient *gif*. *Though* is also a verb now obsolete, except in the imperative mood. Now let us analyze this conditional tense of the verb. "If the man *knows* his true interest, he will avoid a quarrel." Here is an omission of the word *that* after *if*. The true original phrase was, "If *that* the man knows his true interest, he will avoid a quarrel"—that is, *give that* [admit the fact which is expressed in the following clause,] *the man knows his true interest*, then the consequence follows, he will avoid a quarrel. *That* in this sentence is a relative or demonstrative substitute for the following clause. This will more plainly appear by transposing the clauses. "The man *knows* his true interest; *give that* [admit that;] he will then avoid a quarrel." Now let the subjunctive form be used. "The man *know* his true interest; *give that*; he will avoid a quarrel."

Here the impropriety of this form of the verb appears in a strong light. It will appear more clearly by the use of other words of equivalent signification. *Grant* the man *know* his true interest, he will avoid a quarrel. *Allow* the man *know* his true interest. *Suppose* the man *know* his true interest. We never use the subjunctive form after the three last verbs which introduce the condition. *Though* is sometimes followed by the indicative; sometimes by the subjunctive; but it ought always to be followed by the indicative, for it supposes the fact to be given; and so does *admit*, when used in hypothetical sentences. Admit that the man *knows* his interest. We have then decisive proof that the use of the indicative form of the verb after *if*, when it expresses a conditional event in present time, is most correct; indeed, it is the only correct form. This remark is equally applicable to the past tense conditional.

The language of Addison, Johnson, and other distinguished writers of the last century, in the use of the indicative, is therefore more correct than the language of the writers in the age of Elizabeth.

We consider that *general and respectable* usage in *speaking* is the genuine or legitimate language of a country, to which the *written* language ought to be conformed. Language is that which is uttered by the tongue, and if men do not write the language as it is *spoken* by the great body of respectable people, they do not write the *real* language. Now, in colloquial usage, the subjunctive form of the verb, in conditional sentences, is rarely used, and perhaps never, except when the substantive verb is employed. Our students are taught in school the subjunctive form, *if thou have, if he come, &c.*, and some of them continue, in after life, to *write* in that manner; but in the course of more than forty years, we have not known three men who have ventured to use that form of the verb in conversation. We toil in school to learn a language which we dare not introduce into conversation, but which the force of custom compels us to abandon. In this respect, the present study of grammar is worse than useless.

This colloquial custom accords with other languages. The French say and write *s'il est*, if he is. The Latins often used the same form, "*si quid est* in me ingenii, iudices;" but the use of the Latin subjunctive depends on certain other words which precede; as "*cum sit civis*," as he is a citizen, or since he is a citizen; and the present tense is often used to express what we express by an auxiliary. That the Greeks used the indicative to express a conditional present tense, we have seen by citations above.

By this arrangement of the verb, the indicative form after *if* and other verbs introducing a condition or hypothesis, may be used uniformly to express a fact or event under a condition or supposition, either in the present or past tenses; the speaker being uncertain respecting the fact, or representing it as doubtful.

"If the man *is* honest, he will return what he has borrowed."
"If the ship *has* arrived, we shall be informed of it to-morrow." "If the bill *was* presented, it was doubtless paid."
"If the law *has* been passed, we are precluded from further opposition."

On the other hand, when it is intended to speak of a future contingent event, we would always use the auxiliaries that are proper for the purpose. "If it *shall* or *should* rain to-morrow, we shall not ride to town." We would never use the subjunctive form, *if it rain*, in prose; and in poetry, only from necessity, as an abridged phrase, for if it *shall* or *should* rain. In this manner the distinction between the tenses, which are now constantly confounded, may be preserved and made obvious, both to natives and foreigners.

The effect of the study of Lowth's principles, which has been greatly extended by the popularity of Murray's Grammar,* has been to introduce or establish a form of the verb in writing, which is obsolete in colloquial language; to fill our books with a confusion of tenses, and thus to keep the language unsettled. Nothing can be more perplexing to the student, than every where to meet with discrepancies between rules and practice.

There is another erroneous manner of writing, common to the best authors in the language, which seems to have escaped notice. This is, to connect a verb in the past tense with a preceding one in the same tense, when the latter verb is intended to express a very different time from the former. Thus, "Then Manasseh *knew* that the Lord, he *was* God;" 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13.

The Latins, in this case, would probably have used the infinitive; "Manasseh novit Jehovah Deum esse." In English we ought to write and say, "Manasseh *knew* Jehovah to be God," or, "Manasseh *knew* that Jehovah he is God." In most similar cases the use of the infinitive in English is as elegant as in Latin. But there are many cases where the infinitive cannot be used. We cannot use it after *say*; "he *said* him to be a good man," is not English; though "he *declared*, or *affirmed*, or *believed* him to be a good man," is elegant.

In order to understand the impropriety of the common mode of using the latter verb, as in the example above cited, it may be remarked, that the present tense is that which is used to express what exists at all times. Thus we say, God *is* or *exists*, whenever we speak of his permanent existence; we say, Gold *is* yellow or ductile; iron *is* a most valuable metal; it *is* not convertible into silver; plants and animals *are* very distinct living beings. We do not say, Gold *was* yellow; iron *was* a valuable metal; for we mean to express permanent qualities. Hence, in the passage cited from Chronicles, the first verb *knew*, referring to a fact past, is correct; but the last, which is intended to express the permanent being or character of God, should be in the infinitive or the indicative present tense. The following are examples of correct language: "His master had *taught* him that happiness *consists* in virtue." *Anacharsis*, ii. 120.

"Sabellius, who openly *taught* that there *is* but one person in the Godhead." *Encyclopedia*.

"Our Saviour *taught* that eternal death *is* the proper punishment of sin." *Emmons*.

But very different is the following: "Having believed for many years, that water *was* [is] an elastic fluid." The following would be still better: "Having believed water to be an elastic fluid."

So the following: "We know not the use of the epidermis of shells. Some authors have *supposed* that it *secured* [secures] the shells from being covered with vermes." *Edin. Encyc.*

"It *was* just remarked, that marine fossils *did* not [do not] comprise vegetable remains." *Id.*

"If my readers will turn their thoughts back on their old friends, they will find it difficult to call a single name to remembrance who *appeared* to know that life *was* short [is short,] till he was about to lose it." *Rambler*, No. 71.

"They considered the body as a hydraulic machine, and the fluids as passing through a series of chemical changes; forgetting that animation *was* [is] its essential characteristic." *Darwin*.

"It *was* declared by Pompey, that if the Commonwealth

was [should be] violated, he could stamp with his foot and raise an army out of the ground." *Rambler*, No. 10.

In the foregoing sentence, the past tense is used for the future contingent.

"It was affirmed in the last discourse, that much of the honourable practice of the world *rested* [rests] on the substratum of selfishness; that society *was* [is] held together, in the exercise of its relative virtues, mainly by the tie of reciprocal advantage; that a man's own interest *bound* [binds] him to all those average equities which *obtained* [obtain] in the neighbourhood around him; and in which if he *proved* [should prove] himself glaringly deficient, he would be abandoned by the respect, and the confidence, and the good will of the people with whom he *had* [might have, or should have] to do."

Chalmers's Com. Dis. 4.

"In the last discourse, I observed that love *constituted* [constitutes] the whole moral character of God."

Dwight's Theology.

"And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one *went* [shall or should go] to them from the dead, they will repent. And he said to him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one *rose* [shall or should rise] from the dead;" Luke xvi. 30, 31.

"Cicero vindicated the truth, and inculcated the value of the precept, that nothing *was* [is] truly useful which *was* [is] not honest."

"He undertook to show that justice *was* [is] of perpetual obligation."

"The author concedes much of his argument, and admits that the sea *was* [is] susceptible of dominion." [Better still; he admits the sea to be susceptible of dominion.]

"A nation would be condemned by the impartial voice of mankind, if it voluntarily *went* [should go] to war, on a claim of which it *doubted* [should doubt] the legality."

"He held that the law of nations *prohibited* [prohibits] the use of poisoned arms."

"He insisted that the laws of war *gave* [give] no other power over a captive than to keep him safely."

"The general principle on the subject is, that, if a commander *makes* a compact with the enemy, and it be of such a nature that the power to make it *could* be reasonably implied from the nature of the trust, it *would* be valid and binding, though he *abused* his trust." Let any man translate this sentence into another language, if he can, without reducing the verbs to some consistency.

"From his past designs and administrations, we could never argue at all to those which *were* future." [This is an odd combination of words.]

"Jesus knowing that the father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and *went* to God;" John xiii. 3.

"Alexander dispatched Eumenes with three hundred horse to two free cities—with assurance that if they *submitted* and *received* him [should or would submit and receive] as a friend, no evil *should* befall them."

"The apostle *knew* that the present season *was* [is] the only time allowed for this preparation."

"What would be the real effect of that overpowering evidence which our adversaries *required* [should require] in a revelation, it is difficult to *foretell*."

"It could not otherwise have been known that the word *had* [has] this meaning."

"I told him if he *went* [should go] to-morrow, I would go with him."

This fault occurs in our hearing every hour in the day.

A like fault prevails in other languages; indeed the English may have been led into it by reading foreign authors. "Mais on a remarqué avec raison, que l'espace conchoïdal *était* infini." *Lunier*. It has been remarked with reason, that the conchoïdal space *was* [is] infinite.

But whatever may be the practice of other nations, there would be no difficulty in correcting such improprieties in our own language, if as much attention were given to the study of its true principles, as is given to other subjects of literature and science. But if in this particular, there is an English author who writes his vernacular language correctly, his writings have not fallen under our inspection.

* Lindley Murray, in the Introduction to his Grammar, acknowledges, in general terms, that "the authors to whom the grammatical part of this compilation is principally indebted for its materials are, Harris, Johnson, Lowth, Priestley, Beattie, Sheridan, Walker, and Coote." But on examination it appears that the greatest portion of the grammatical part is from Lowth, whose principles form the main structure of Murray's compilation. Some valuable notes and remarks are taken from Priestley's Grammar.

There is another fault very common among English writers; this is the conversion of an intransitive verb into a passive one. It is surprising that an error of this kind should have gained such an established use, in some foreign languages, as to be incurable. Barbarous nations may indeed form languages; but it should be the business of civilized men to purify their language from barbarisms.

In the transitive verb, there is an agent that performs some action on an object, or in some way affects it. When this verb becomes passive, the agent and the object change places in the sentence. Thus, *John loves Peter*, is transitive, but *Peter is loved by John*, is passive. In the intransitive verb the case is different; for the action is limited to the agent; and when it is stated that a thing is done, there is no agent by which it is done. *I perish*, is intransitive; *I am perished*, is the passive form; but the latter neither expresses nor implies an agent by which I perish.

This fault occurs frequently in the common version of the Scriptures.

"Yea, whereto might the strength of their hands profit me, in whom old age *was* [had] *perished*." Job xxx. 2.

"Their memorial *is* [has] *perished* with them." Ps. ix. 6.

"The heathen *are* [have] *perished* out of this land." Ps. x. 16.

"Israel *is* [has] *fled* before the Philistines." 1 Sam. iv. 17.

"David *is* [has] *fled*." 2 Sam. xix. 9.

"The days *were* [had] *not expired*." 1 Sam. xviii. 26.

"And when the year *was* [had] *expired*." 2 Chron. xxxv. 10.

"I only *am* [have] *escaped* alone to tell thee." Job i. 15.

"And it came to pass, when he *was* [had] *returned*." Luke xix. 15.

Return is sometimes a transitive verb, and sometimes intransitive. When a sum of borrowed money is *returned*, the phrase is correct, for this is the passive form of a transitive verb. But when a man is *returned*, we may ask, who has returned him? In this case, the man returns by his own act, and he cannot be said to be *returned*.

"He found the Empress *was* [had] *departed*." *Core*.

"They *were* [had] *arrived* within three days' journey of the spice country." *Gibbon*, Ch. i. Note.

"Neither Charles nor Diocletian *was* [had] *arrived* at a very advanced period of life." *Id*. Ch. xiii.

"The posterity of so many gods and heroes *was* [had] *fallen* into the most abject state." *Id*. Ch. ii.

"Silver *was* [had] *grown* more common." *Id*.

"He *was* [had] *risen* from the dead, and *was* [had] *just ascended* to heaven." *Milner*, i. 20.

"Hearing that they *were* [had] *arrived*." *Id*. 211.

"Claudius—vexed because his wife *was* [had] *become* a Christian." *Id*. 274.

"Does not the reader see how much we *are* [have] already *departed* from Christian simplicity?" *Id*. 299.

"My age *is* [has] *departed*." Isaiah xxxviii. 12.

"The man out of whom the demons *were* [had] *departed*." Luke viii. 35.

"Workmen *were* [had] *arrived* to assist them." *Mitford*.

"A body of Athenian horse *was* [had] *just arrived*." *Id*.

This fault is common in Mitford's History of Greece. In the writings of Roscoe, which are more elegant, it occurs, but less frequently.

"The time limited for the reception of the cardinal *was expired*." *Roscoe*, Leo. X.

"He inquired whether the report was true, that a legate *was arrived*." *Id*. L. Med.

"The nation *being* [having] once more *got* into a course of borrowing." *Price on Liberty*.

"When he *was* [had] *retired* to his tent." *Coxe's Russ*.

"He *was* [had] *not yet arrived*." *Id*.

The intransitive verb *grow* is constantly used as a transitive verb, as, to *grow* wheat.

It seems almost incredible that such errors should continue,

to this time, to disfigure the language of the most distinguished writers, and that they should escape animadversion. The practice has evidently been borrowed from the French or Italian; but surely no lover of correctness can excuse such violation of the best established principles in our language.

There is a grammatical error running through the writings of so respectable a writer as Mitford, which ought not to be passed unnoticed; as it seems to be borrowed from the French language, whose idioms are different from the English, but which the English are too apt to follow. This fault is, in using the preterite or perfect tense, instead of the past tense indefinite, usually called, most improperly, the *imperfect*. Take the following sentences for examples. "The conduct of Pelopidas toward Arcadia and its minister at the Persian court—*has scarcely been* the result of mere caprice or resentment." The verb here ought to be *was*.

"The oration [of Isocrates] *has been* [was] a favourite of Dionysius of Halicarnassus."

This form of expressing the time would be good in French, but is very bad in English. And it may be here remarked, that the tense *he was*, *he arrived*, *he wrote*, is not properly named *imperfect*. These verbs, and all verbs of this form, denote actions finished or perfect, as "In six days God *created* the heaven and the earth." Imperfect or unfinished action is expressed in English in this manner, he *was reading*, they *were writing*. The error of calling the former tense *imperfect*, has probably proceeded from a servile adoption of the Latin names of the tenses, without considering the difference of application.

There are some errors in all the English Grammars, that have been derived to us from antiquity. Such is the arrangement of *that* among the conjunctions, like the Greek *οτι*, and the Latin *ut*. Και μακαρια η πιστις ασα, οτι ισται τιλιουσις σεις λιδαλμησις αυτη πρεση Κυριου. And blessed is she who believed that there shall be a performance of the things which were told her from the Lord; Luke i. 45. In our version, *οτι* is rendered *for*, but most erroneously. The true meaning and character of *οτι* will best appear, by a transposition of the clauses of the verse: "There shall be a performance of the things told her from the Lord; blessed or happy is she who believed *that*." Here *οτι*, *that*, appears to be what it really is, a relative or substitute for the whole clause in Greek succeeding it. So in Luke xxii. 18. Λιγω γαρ υμιν οτι ου μη πτω, &c. I say to you *that* I will not drink. I will not drink, I say to you *that*. It is the same in Latin, "Dico enim vobis quod non bibam." *Quod* is here a relative governed by *dico*, and referring to the following clause of the sentence.

So also Matthew ix. 28. Πιστευετε οτι δυναμει τουτο ποιησαι; Do ye believe that I am able to do this? I am able to do this, do ye believe *that*?

This error runs through all Grammars, Greek, Latin, French, English, &c. But how such an obvious fact, that the word *that* and its corresponding words in other languages, refer to the clause of a sentence, should escape observation, age after age, it is not easy to explain. How could it be supposed that a word is a conjunction which does not join words or sentences? *That* is used, in the passages cited, not to *unite* two sentences, but to *continue* the same sentence by an additional clause.

The relative, when referring to a sentence or the clause of a sentence, is not varied, for a variation of case is not wanted.

So notwithstanding and provided in English, and *pourvu que* in French, are called conjunctions, but most improperly; as they are participles, and when called conjunctions, they always form, with a word, clause or sentence, the case absolute or independent. Thus, "It rains, but notwithstanding *that*, [it rains,] I must go to town." That fact (it rains) not opposing or preventing me, that is, in opposition to that, I must go to town; *hoc non obstante*.

"I will ride, provided you will accompany me." That is, I will ride, the fact, you will accompany me, being provided.

Such is the structure of these sentences. It is the same in French, *pourvu que*, that being provided, *que* referring to the following clause.

There are other points in grammar equally faulty. Not only in English grammar, but in the grammars of other languages, men stumble at the threshold, and teach their children

* On this use of intransitive verbs, as the ship *was departed*, it may be asked, who departed it? The mail is *arrived*, who has arrived it? The tree is *perished*, who has perished it? The enemy *was fled*, who fled them? The time *was expired*, who expired it?

to stumble. In no language whatever can there be a part of speech properly called an *article*. There is no word or class of words that falls within the signification of *article*, a joint, or that can otherwise than arbitrarily be brought under that denomination. The definitive words called *articles*, are all *adjectives* or *pronouns*. When they are used with nouns, they are *adjectives*, modifying the signification of the nouns, like other adjectives; for this is their proper office. When they stand alone, they are *pronouns*, or *substitutes* for nouns. Thus *hic*, *ille*, *ipse*, in Latin, when used with nouns expressed, are adjectives; *hic homo*, this man; *ille homo*, that man. When they stand alone, *hic*, *ille*, they stand in the place of nouns. The fact is the same in other languages.

The English *the* is an adjective, which, for distinction, we call a *definitive adjective*, and for brevity, a *definitive*, as it defines the person or thing to which it refers, or rather designates a particular person or thing. But why this should be selected as the only definitive in our language, is very strange; when obviously *this* and *that* are more exactly definitive, designating more precisely a particular person or thing than *the*. These words answer to the Latin *hic* and *ille*, which were always used by the Romans, when they had occasion to specify definite persons or things.

As to the English *an* or *a*, which is called in grammars the *indefinite article*, there are two great mistakes. *A* being considered as the original word, it is said to become *an* before a vowel. The fact is directly the reverse. *An* is the original word, and this is contracted to *a* by dropping the *n* before a consonant.

But *an* is merely the Saxon orthography of *one*, *un*, *wnus*, an adjective found in nearly all the languages of Europe, and expressing a single person or thing. It is merely a word of number, and no more an *article* than *two*, *three*, *four*, and every other number in the language. Take the following examples.

Bring me *an* orange from the basket; that is, any *one* of the number.

Bring me *two* oranges from the basket; that is, any *two* of the number.

Bring me *three* oranges from the basket; that is, any *three* of the number; and so on to any number *ad infinitum*.

When thus used, *an*, *two*, *three*, are all indefinite; that is, they are used with nouns which are indefinite, or expressing things not particularly designated. But this is not owing to the essential character of the adjectives, *an*, *one*, *two*, *three*; for any of them may be used with definite nouns; and *an* is continually thus used.

"I will be *an* adversary to thine adversaries."

"The angel stood for *an* adversary against Balaam."

"Make this fellow return, lest in the battle he be *an* adversary to us."

"Rezon ... was *an* adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon."

"And he spake *a* parable to them to this end."

"And there was *a* widow in that city."

"And seeing the multitude, he went up into *a* mountain."

"I will be *a* God to thee and thy seed after thee."

"Thou art *a* God ready to pardon."

Now let any of these phrases be tested by the common definition of *an* or *a*, "that it is used in a vague sense, to point out one single thing of the kind; in other respects indeterminate." Louth.

"I will be *an* adversary to thine adversaries;" that is, "I will be *any* adversary," one of the kind, but vague or indeterminate.

"Rezon was *an* adversary to Israel;" that is, in a vague sense *any* adversary, indeterminate.

"And he spake *a* parable to them;" that is, *any* parable, indeterminate.

"Thou art *a* God ready to pardon;" that is, *any* God, one of the kind, in a vague sense, indeterminate!

If it should be said, the noun is rendered determinate, by other words in the sentence, and not by *an* or *a*, this may be and generally is true; but this shows that *an* does not give to the noun its character of definiteness or indefiniteness; it always retains its proper signification, which is *one*, and nothing

more; and it is used indifferently before nouns definite or indefinite.

This mistake of the character of *an* is found in other languages.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

From the period of the first Saxon writings, our language has been suffering changes in orthography. The first writers, having no guide but the ear, followed each his own judgment or fancy; and hence a great portion of Saxon words are written with different letters, by different authors; most of them are written two or three different ways, and some of them fifteen or twenty. To this day the orthography of some classes of words is not entirely settled; and in others it is settled in a manner to confound the learner, and mislead him into a false pronunciation. Nothing can be more disreputable to the literary character of a nation, than the history of English orthography, unless it is that of orthoepey.

1. The Saxon diphthong *æ*, which probably had a specific and uniform sound or combination of sounds, has been discarded and *ea* generally substituted in its place, as *bræth*, *breath*. Now *ea* thus united have not a uniform sound, and of course they are no certain guide to pronunciation. In some instances, where the Saxon spelling was not uniform, the modern orthography follows the most anomalous and difficult, instead of that which is regular. Thus the Saxons wrote *fæther* and *fether*, more generally the latter, and the moderns write *feather*.

2. The letter *g* in Saxon words, has, in many English words, been sunk in pronunciation, and either wholly lost, or it is now represented by *y* or *io*. Thus *dag*, or *dag*, has become *day*; *gear* is *year*, *bugan* is *bow*, and *fæger* is *fair*.

3. The Saxons, who adopted the Roman alphabet, with a few alterations, used *c* with its close sound like that of *k*. Thus *lic*, like; *locian*, to look. But after the Norman conquest, *c* before *e*, *i*, and *y*, took the sound of *s*: hence arose the necessity of changing this letter in words and syllables, where it was necessary to retain the sound of *k* before these vowels. Thus the Saxon *licean*, pronounced originally *likean*, becomes, with our present sound of *c* before *e*, *lisean*; and *locian* becomes *losian*. To remedy this evil, our ancestors introduced *k* from the Greek, writing it generally after *e*, as in *lick*, *stick*, though in some instances, omitting *c*, as in *like* and *look*. Hence in all monosyllables in which a syllable beginning with *e* or *i* is added to the word, as in the past time and participles of verbs, we use *k* in the place of the Saxon *c*, as in *licked*, *licking*.

Our early writers attempted to extend this addition to words introduced from the Latin and Greek, in which no such reason exists for the use of *k*. Thus they wrote *publick*, *musicke*, *rhetorick*. In these and similar words the Latins used *c* for the Greek *κ*, as *musicus*, for *μουσικός*, and the early English writers took both letters, the Roman *c* and Greek *κ*. This was absurd enough; but they never proceeded so far as to carry the absurdity through the derivatives; never writing *publickation*, *musickeal*, *rhetorickal*, *catholicism*, *skeptickism*, *stoickism*. After a long struggle with the force of authority, good sense has nearly banished this pedantic orthography from use; and all words of this kind now appear, in most of our public acts and elegant writings, in their proper simplicity; *public*, *publication*, *music*, *musical*.

4. In many words, formerly ending in *ie*, these letters have been discarded from the singular number, and *y* substituted. Thus *remedie*, *memorie*, are now written *remedy*, *memory*. But what is very singular, the plural of these words retains the *ie*, with the addition of *s*, as in *remedies*. This anomaly, however, creates no great inconvenience, except that it has been extended by negligent writers to words ending in *ey*, as in *attornies*. But words ending in *ey* properly make the plural by simply taking *s*, as in *surveys*, *attorneys*. The same rule applies to verbs when an *s* is added, as in *conveys*.

5. In a vast number of words the vowel *e* has been discarded as useless; as in *eggs* for *egges*; *certain* for *certaine*; *empress*, for *empressse*; *goodness* for *goodnesse*. This is an improvement, as the *e* has no sound in modern pronunciation. But here again we meet with a surprising inconsistency; for the same reason which justifies this omission, would justify and

require the omission of *e* final in *notice*, *pensive*, *juvenile*, *genuine*, *sanguine*, *doctrine*, *examine*, *determine*, and a multitude of others. The introduction of *e*, in most words of these classes, was at first wrong, as it could not plead any authority in the originals; but the retaining of it is unjustifiable, as the letter is not merely useless, but, in very numerous classes of words, it leads to a false pronunciation. Many of the most respectable English authors, a century ago or more, omitted *e* in such words as *examine*, *determine*, *famine*, *duetli*, *fertil*, *definit*, &c., but these improvements were afterwards rejected, to the great injury of orthography. In like manner, a final *e* is inserted in words of modern coinage, as in *alumine*, *chlorine*, *chloride*, *oxide*, &c., without the least necessity or propriety.

6. A similar fate has attended the attempt to anglicize the orthography of another class of words, which we have received from the French. At a very early period, the words *chambre*, *draught*, *desordre*, *charire*, *monstre*, *tendre*, *tigre*, *entre*, *fièvre*, *diametre*, *arbitre*, *nombre*, and others, were reduced to the English form of spelling; *chamber*, *disaster*, *disorder*, *charter*, *monster*, *tender*, *tiger*, *enter*, *fever*, *diameter*, *arbiter*, *number*. At a later period, Sir Isaac Newton, Camden, Selden, Milton, Whitaker, Prideaux, Hook, Whiston, Bryant, and other authors of the first character, attempted to carry through this reformation, writing *scepter*, *center*, *sepulcher*. But this improvement was arrested, and a few words of this class retain their French orthography; such are *metre*, *mitre*, *nitre*, *spectre*, *sceptre*, *theatre*, *sepulchre*, and *centre*. It is remarkable that a nation distinguished for erudition, should thus reject improvements, and retain anomalies, in opposition to all the convenience of uniformity. In the present instance, want of uniformity is not the only evil. The present orthography has introduced an awkward mode of writing the derivatives, for example, *centred*, *sceptred*, *sepulchred*; whereas Milton and Pope wrote these words as regular derivations of *center*, *scepter*, *sepulcher*: thus, "*sceptered* king." So Cox, in his *Travels*, "The principal wealth of the church is *centered* in the monasteries." This is correct.

7. Soon after the revival of letters in Europe, English writers began to borrow words from the French and Italian; and usually with some little alteration of the orthography. Thus they wrote *ambour*, *embassadour*, *predecessour*, *ancestour*, *successour*; using *our* for the Latin termination *or*, and the French *eur*, and writing similar words in like manner, though not of Latin or French original. What motive could induce them to write these words, and *errour*, *honour*, *favour*, *inferiour*, &c., in this manner, following neither the Latin nor the French, I cannot conceive. But this orthography continued down to the seventeenth century, when the *u* began to be rejected from certain words of this class, and at the beginning of the last century, many of these words were written, *ancestor*, *author*, *error*, &c., as they are now written. But *favor*, *honor*, *labor*, *candor*, *ardor*, *terror*, *vigor*, *inferior*, *superior*, and a few others, were written with *u*, and Johnson introduced this orthography into his Dictionary. Nothing in language is more mischievous than the mistakes of a great man. It is not easy to understand why a man, whose professed object was to reduce the language to some regularity, should write *author* without *u*, and *errour* and *honour* with it! That he should write *labour* with *u*, and *laborious* without it! *Vigour* with *u*, and *vigorous*, *invigorate*, without it! *Inferiour*, *superiour*, with *u*, but *inferiority* and *superiority*, without it! Strange as it is, this inconsistency runs through his work, and his authority has been the means of continuing it, among his admirers, to this day.

8. There is another class of words, the orthography of which is not uniform nor fully settled, such as take the termination *able* to form an adjective. Thus Johnson writes *provable* with *e*, but *approvable* and *reprovable*, without it. So *moveable*, but *immoveable* and *removable*; *tameable*, but *blamable*, *censurable*, *desirable*, *excusable*; *saleable*, but *ratable*.

With like inconsistency Walker and Chalmers write *daub* with *u*, and *bedaub* with *o*, deviating in this instance from Johnson. Chalmers writes *abridgement* and *judgement* with *e*, but *acknowledgment* without it. Walker writes these words without *e*, but adds it to *lodgement*.

9. Johnson writes *octoedrical*; Chalmers *octoedral*; Sheridan, Walker, and Jones follow Johnson; but Jones has *octahedron*, which is not in the other Dictionaries. The Greek, in words of this kind, is inconsistent, for *οκτω* is changed, in compound words, to *οκτα*.

10. Johnson introduced *instructor*, in the place of *instructor*, in opposition to every authority which he has himself adduced to exemplify his definitions; Denham, Milton, Roscommon, Locke, Addison, Rogers, and the common version of the Scriptures. But what is more singular, this orthography, *instructor*, is contrary to his own practice; at least, in four editions of his *Rambler* which we have examined, the word is uniformly written *instructor*. The fact is the same with *visitor*.

11. Most of these and some other inconsistencies have been of long continuance. But there are others of more recent date, which admit of no apology, as they are changes from right to wrong. Such is the change of the correct orthography of *defense*, *expense*, *offense*, *pretense*, and *recompense*, by substituting *c* for *s* as in *defence*. This change was probably made or encouraged by printers, for the sake of avoiding the use of the old long *s*; but since this has been discarded, that reason no longer exists. The orthography, *defense*, &c., is justified, not only by the Latin originals, but by the rule of uniformity; for the derivatives are always written with *s*, *defensive*, *extensive*, *offensive*, *pretension*, *recompensing*.

12. No less improper was the change of *sceptic* into *skeptic*. In favour of this innovation, it is alledged that the word is from the Greek *σκιπτικός*. True; but is not *scene* derived from the Greek *σκηνη*, and *sceptre* from *σκηπτρον*, and *ascetic* from *ασκητικός*, and *ocean* from *οκεανος*? Are not all these words in exact analogy with each other, in their original orthography? Were they not formerly analogous in the English orthography? Why violate this analogy? Why introduce an anomaly? Such innovations, by dividing opinions and introducing discrepancies in practice, in classes of words of like formation, have a mischievous effect, by keeping the language in perpetual fluctuation.

13. In like manner, *dispatch*, which had, from time immemorial, been written with *i*, was changed into *despatch*, on the wonderful discovery that the word is derived from the French *dépêcher*. But why change one vowel and not the other? If we must follow the French, why not write *despech*, or *depech*? And why was this innovation limited to a single word? Why not carry the change through this whole class of words, and give us the benefit of uniformity? Is not *disaster* from the French *desastre*? Is not *discharge* from *decharger*? Is not *disarm* from *desarmer*? Is not *disobey* from *desobeir*? Is not *disoblige* from *desobliger*? Is not *disorder* from *desordre*? The prefix *dis* is more properly English than *de*, though both are used with propriety. But *dispatch* was the established orthography; why then disturb the practice? Why select a single word from the whole class, and introduce a change which creates uncertainty where none had existed for ages, without the smallest benefit to indemnify us for the perplexity and discordance occasioned by the innovation? Now let it be observed that Johnson himself wrote *dispatch*; for this orthography occurs twice under *SEND* in his Dictionary, and five times under *SPEED*.

14. The omission of one *l* in *befall*, *install*, *installment*, *recall*, *enthral*, &c., is by no means to be vindicated; as by custom, the two letters *ll*, serve as a guide to the true pronunciation, that of broad *a* or *aw*.

15. It is an established rule, in the English language, that monosyllabic verbs ending in a single consonant, not preceded by a long vowel, and other verbs ending in a single accented consonant, and of course not preceded by a long vowel, double the final consonant, in all the derivatives, which are formed by a termination beginning with a vowel. Thus, *fit*, *blot*, *bar*, when they take the terminations *ed*, *eth*, *ing*, are written *fitted*, *fitteth*, *fitting*; *blotted*, *blotteth*, *blotting*; *barred*, *barreth*, *barring*. *Abel*, *compel*, form the like derivatives; *abetted*, *abetteth*, *abetting*; *compelled*, *compelleth*, *compelling*. The reason of this rule is, that without this duplication of the last consonant, the vowel of the primitive word would, in the derivative, be naturally pronounced wrong, that is, with its long sound; *fiting*, *bloting*, *barred*, *compelled*. Hence we see

the reason why verbs, having the long sound of a vowel, do not double the last consonant, as *feared*, *repeated*.

The converse of this rule is, that verbs ending in a single consonant, but having the accent on the first syllable, or on a syllable preceding the last, ought *not* to double the final consonant in the derivatives. Thus, *limit*, *labour*, *charter*, *clatter*, *pardon*, *deliver*, *hinder*, have for their derivatives, *limited*, *laboured*, *chartered*, *pardoning*, *delivering*, *hindering*. But, strange as it may seem, the rule is wholly neglected and violated in numerous words of this class. Thus we observe, in all authors, *ballotting*, *levelling*, *levelled*, *travelled*, *cancelled*, *revelling*, *rivaling*, *worshipped*, *worshipper*, *apparelled*, *embowelled*, *libelling*, and many others, in which the last consonant is doubled, in opposition to one of the oldest and best established rules in the language. Perry, in his Dictionary, lays down the rule for guidance, but has not been careful, in all cases, to observe it.

Not less remarkable is the practice of doubling the last consonant in *equalled*, *equaling*, but not in the verb *equalize*. And to add to the inconsistency, the last consonant is doubled in *tranquillize*, a word in exact analogy with *equalize*.

A singular instance of inattention to analogy or uniformity, occurs in the formation of certain words from the Greek. Thus in *anatomy*, *bronchotomy*, *cacophony*, *euphony*, *lithotomy*, and others, the final vowel of the Greek original is represented in English by *y*, which makes a syllable. But in *epitome*, *catastrophe*, *hyperbole*, and many others, the final vowel of the Greek is represented by *e*, which, in words of English origin, rarely or never makes a syllable at the end of a word. The consequence is, that the last two syllables are liable to be pronounced in one, *tome*, *phe*, *bole*. Such a departure from analogy is very inconvenient. Besides, if the letter *y* closed the words in the singular number, the plural would be regularly formed by changing *y* into *ies*.

A like fault is observable in the spelling of certain derivatives ending in *er*. In *barometer*, *hygrometer*, *thermometer*, and all similar derivatives, the Greek *μετρος* gives *meter*, in English, while in English books the word is written *metre*, like the French word. The French are consistent, for they write the word in the same manner, both when single and in composition. Such discrepancies in the English language are little honourable to English philologists.

In the use of the prefixes *en*, *em*, *in*, *im*, there is not uniformity nor settled usage. The French changed the Latin *in* into *en* or *em*, and English authors have adopted one or the other, without regard to any settled rule. Johnson's Dictionary has done something toward reducing the number of discrepancies of this kind; but some changes have, since his time, been introduced.

In the use of the prefix *un*, many changes have taken place within the last century or two, and the use of *in* has been substituted for *un*; as *inaccessible* for *unaccessible*.

In the use of the termination *ize*, the English books are all at variance with each other; and no lexicographer is consistent with himself. Hence we every day see *authorise* and *authorize*, *apostatise* and *apostatize*, *temporise* and *temporize*.

There are many words in the language containing superfluous letters, especially in the terminating syllable. Thus, one *s* in the syllables *less* and *mess*, at the end of words, is useless; one *l* in *gill*, *rill*, *sill*, *dull*; one *f* in *cliff*, *bluff*, are superfluous.

The rule for adding two consonants of a sort should be, to add two letters to the original word, when they are both wanted in the derivatives. Thus *fil* would give the sound of *fill*; but this being a verb, the two letters are required in the past tense and participles, *filled*, *filling*. So in the adjective *siff*, the second letter is wanted in *stiffen*, otherwise a person would be apt to pronounce the word *sti-fen*.

But in some words the terminating consonant is doubled, not only without necessity or use, but in opposition to propriety. *Plaintiff* is the French *plaintif*; *pontiff* is the French *pontife*; and no possible reason can be assigned for adding an *f* to the original word, any more than for adding the same letter to *brief* and *relief*. And what is worse, the letter is doubled in *pontiff*, the original, and then omitted in all the derivatives, *pontificate*, *pontifical*, &c.

In like manner, the vowel *e* is added to a multitude of

words, in which it is not pronounced, and is worse than useless, as it often misleads the learner in the pronunciation. If the final *e* were omitted in *juvenil*, *volatil*, the pronunciation could not be mistaken; but as the preceding vowel is sometimes long and sometimes short in the terminating syllables, *ile*, *ine*, *ife*, the final *e* serves only to perplex the learner.

In the terminating syllable *ive*, the final *e* is worse than useless, as the *i* is always short, *iv*, and the addition of *e* contravenes the general rule, that the vowel followed by a consonant and *e* final, is generally long, as in *mate*, *mole*, *mute*, *dissipate*.

Our modern writers seem to delight in this useless addition of *e* final; as they annex it to words without reason or authority. This fault occurs frequently in words borrowed from foreign languages, in which the letter is not found in the original language. One would suppose that good taste alone ought to correct this error.

It is much easier, however, to point out the anomalies, inconsistencies, and irregularities of English orthography, than to devise any effectual plan by which they may be removed; and we conceive that any attempt on the part of a lexicographer to introduce a regular and uniform system of orthography, based upon proper principles, would prove a complete failure. Horace justly remarks:—

“*Multa renascentur, quæ jam cecidere; caduntque
Quæ nunc sunt in honore, vocabula, si volet usus,
Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi.*”

And so it is in regard to orthography; the public will never take their mode of spelling from a Dictionary, but will rather expect that a Dictionary shall take its mode of spelling from them. Accordingly in this Dictionary we have adhered as far as possible to the established orthography of words, and in regard to those words of which there are different modes of spelling, we have endeavoured to select that mode which seems to be best authorized.

PRONUNCIATION.

As our language has been derived from various sources, and little or no systematic effort has been made to reduce the orthography to any regularity, the pronunciation of the language is subject to numerous anomalies. Each of our vowels has several different sounds; and some of the consonants represent very different articulations of the organs. That part of the language which we have received from the Latin, is easily subjected to a few general rules of pronunciation. The same is the fact with most of the derivatives from the Greek. Many words of French origin retain their French orthography, which leads to a very erroneous pronunciation in English; and a large portion of our monosyllabic words of Saxon origin are extremely irregular both in orthography and pronunciation.

If we can judge, with tolerable certainty, from the versification of Chaucer, the pronunciation of words must have been, in many respects, different in his age, from that of the present day; particularly in making a distinct syllable of *e* final, and of the termination *ed*. But no effort was probably ever made to settle the pronunciation of words, till the last century. In England, which was settled by various nations, there are numerous dialects or diversities of language still retained by the great mass of the population.

Towards the close of last century, Thomas Sheridan, an Irish gentleman, who had been the pupil of an intimate friend of Dean Swift, attempted to reduce the pronunciation of English words to some system, and to introduce it into popular use. His analysis of the English vowels is very critical, and in this respect, there has been little improvement by later writers, though we think none of them are perfectly correct. But in the application of his principles, he failed of his object. Either he was not well acquainted with the best English pronunciation, or he had a disposition to introduce into use some peculiarities which the English did not relish. The principal objection made to his scheme is, that he gives to *s* the sound of *sh*, in *sudorific*, *superb*, and other words where *s* is followed by *u* long. These he pronounces *shoodorific*, *shooperb*, *shoopersfluity*, &c. This pronunciation of *s* corresponding to the Shemitic *sh* he probably learnt in Ireland, for in the Irish

branch of the Celtic, *s* has often the sound of *sh*. Thus *sean*, old, is pronounced *shean*. This pronunciation was no sooner published, than condemned and rejected by the English.

Another most extraordinary innovation of Sheridan was, his rejection of the Italian sound of *a*, as in *father*, *calm*, *ask*, from every word in the language. Thus his notation gives to *a* in *bar*, the same sound as in *barren*, *barrel*, *bat*; to *a* in *father*, *pass*, *mass*, *pant*, the same sound as in *fat*, *passion*, *massacre*, *pan*, *fancy*. Such a gross deviation from established English usage was of course condemned and rejected.

In his pronunciation of *ti* and *ci*, before a vowel, as in *partiality*, *omniscience*, Sheridan is more correct than Walker, as he is in some other words; such, for example, as *bench*, *tench*, *book*, *took*, and others of the same classes.

Book also contributed very much to propagate the change of *tu* into *chu*, or *tshu*; as in *natshur*, *cultshur*, *virtshue*. This innovation was vindicated on the supposed fact, that the letter *u* has the sound of *yu*; and *natyur*, *cultyur*, *virtue*, in a rapid enunciation, become *natshur*, &c. And to this day, this error respecting the sound of *u* is received in England as truth. But the fact is otherwise, and if not, it does not justify the practice; for in usage, *u* is short in *nature*, *culture*.

This innovation, however, has prevailed to a considerable extent, although Sheridan subjected the change of *tu* to no rules. He is consistent in applying this change equally to *tu*, whether the accent follows the *t* or not. If *tu* is to be changed to *tshu*, in *future*, and *perpetual*, it ought to undergo the same change in *futurity*, and *perpetuity*; and Sheridan, in pronouncing *tutor*, *tutelage*, *tumult*, as if written *tshootor*, *tshootelage*, *tshoomult*, is certainly consistent, though wrong in fact. In other words, however, Sheridan is inconsistent with himself; for he pronounces *multitshood*, *rectitshood*, *servitshood*, while *habitude*, *beatitude*, *certitude*, *decrepitude*, *gratitude*, &c., retain the proper sound of *t*.

Walker's rule for changing *tu* to *chu*, only when the accent precedes, is entirely arbitrary, and evidently made by him to suit his own practice. It has, however, the good effect of reducing the *chus*, and removing the outrageous anomalies of *tshootor*, *tshoomult*, &c.

There are many other words which Sheridan has marked for a pronunciation, which is not according to good usage, and which the later orthoepists have corrected. In general, however, it may be asserted that his notation does not warrant a tenth part as many deviations from the present respectable usage in England, as Walker's.

In a few years after the publication of Sheridan's Dictionary, appeared Walker's, the author of which introduces the work to the public with the following remarks on the labours of his predecessors.

"Among those writers who deserve the first praise on this subject, is Mr. Elphinstone, who, in his Principles of the English Language, has reduced the chaos to a system, and laid the foundation of a just and regular pronunciation. But this gentleman, by treating his subject with an affected obscurity, and by absurdly endeavouring to alter the whole orthography of the language, has unfortunately lost his credit with the public, for the part of his labours which entitles him to the highest praise."

"After him, Dr. Kenrick contributed a portion of improvement, by his Rhetorical Dictionary; but he has rendered his Dictionary extremely imperfect, by entirely omitting a great number of words of doubtful and difficult pronunciation; those very words for which a Dictionary of this kind would naturally be consulted." [Let it be noted, that the same objection lies in full force against Sheridan, Walker, and Jones.]

"To him succeeded Mr. Sheridan, who not only divided the words into syllables, and placed figures over the vowels, as Dr. Kenrick had done, but by spelling these syllables as they are pronounced, seemed to complete the idea of a Pronouncing Dictionary, and to leave but little expectation of improvement. It must be confessed that his Dictionary is generally superior to every thing that preceded it, and his method of conveying the sound of words by spelling them as they are pronounced, is highly rational and useful. But here sincerity obliges me to stop. The numerous instances I have given of impropriety, inconsistency, and want of acquaintance with the analogies of

the language, sufficiently show how imperfect I think his Dictionary is, upon the whole, and what ample room was left for attempting another, that might better answer the purpose of a guide to pronunciation."

"The last writer on this subject is Mr. Nares, who, in his Elements of Orthoepy, has shown a clearness of method, and an extent of observation, which deserve the highest encomiums. But he seems, on many occasions, to have mistaken the best usage, and to have paid too little attention to the first principles of pronunciation."

Soon after the publication of Walker's Dictionary, appeared the Dictionary of Stephen Jones, who undertakes to correct the errors of Sheridan and Walker. This author objects to Sheridan, that he has not introduced the Italian sound of *a* [as in *father*,] in a single instance, and that Walker has been too sparing in the use of it. He objects that Sheridan has not, by any peculiar marks, pointed out the sound of *oi* or *oy* as in *noise* and *cloy*; and that Walker has given distinct marks of pronunciation to the diphthong *ou*, which are terrific to the learner, and not well calculated to express the exact sound. He considers it as no trivial error in Walker's system, that he uses the long *e* in place of the short *y*, which gives to *asperity*, for example, the ludicrous sound of *aspeereete*. He notices also as a fault in Walker's scheme, that he makes no difference in the sound of *oo* in *tool*, *tooth*, and in *look*, *took*.

In all these particulars, except that of *oi* and *oy*, we think every man who understands genuine English will accord with Jones.

A few years after the appearance of Jones's Dictionary, William Perry published a Pronouncing Dictionary, in which an attempt is made to indicate the sounds of the letters by certain arbitrary marks. In this work, the author has rejected most of the peculiarities of Sheridan, Walker, and Jones, and given the language nearly as it was spoken, before these authors undertook to regulate the pronunciation. This author's manner of designating the sounds of the letters is too complex for convenience, but his pronunciation is nearer to the actual usage in England than that of either of his predecessors before mentioned. His orthography also is more correct, according to present usage, than that of his predecessors.

During the year 1828, appeared the Dictionary of R. S. Jameson, of Lincoln's Inn, intended to combine the merits of the most popular Dictionaries, and to correct the false pronunciation of Walker, whose notation, in some classes of words, he entirely rejects. He condemns, as a slovenly enunciation, the sound given to *d*, which, before *i* and *u*, Walker directs, in certain words, to be pronounced like *j*. He rejects also his notation of *ch*, or *tsh*, in *congratulation*, *fluent*, *natural*, and all similar words. He rejects also the affected pronunciation of Sheridan and Walker, in such words as *guide* and *kind*. Most of the other errors of Walker he copies, as he does his antiquated orthography.

The English orthoepists have analyzed, and in general have well defined or described, the sounds and appropriate uses of the letters of the alphabet. Sheridan's analysis, which appeared a few years before Walker's, is, for the most part, correct; but in describing the sounds of what may be called the diphthongal vowel *i*, we think he has erred, in making it to consist of the broad *a* or *aw* and *e*. He admits, indeed, that the voice does not rest on the sound *aw*, but he contends that the mouth is opened to the same degree of aperture, and is in the same position, as if it were going to sound *aw*; but before the voice can get a passage to the lips, the under jaw is drawn up to the position for sounding *e*. On this it is justly remarked by Walker, that *aw* and *e* are precisely the component elements of the diphthong *oi* and *oy*. If the *aw* is pronounced, we would add, then *i* and *oy* must be pronounced exactly alike; and if *aw* is not pronounced, then it is not a component part of the diphthongal vowel *i*.

Walker contends that this diphthong *i*, is composed of the sound of the Italian *a*, as in *father*, and the sound of *e*. If so, he must have given to *a* a very different sound from that which we are accustomed to give it. But this is a mistake; that sound of *a* is no more heard in *i*, than the sound of *aw*. The sound of *i* in *fight*, *mind*, *time*, *idle*, is not *faweght*, *mawend*, *tawem*, *awedle*; nor is it *faght*, *mænd*, *tæm*, *ædle*. Let any man utter the *aw* or the Italian *a* before the *e*, and he

will instantly perceive the error, and reject both definitions, as leading to a false pronunciation. The truth is, the mouth, in uttering *i*, is not opened so wide as in uttering *aw* or *ä*; the initial sound is *not* that of *aw* or *ä*; nor is it possible, by any characters we possess, to express the true sound on paper. The initial sound is not formed so deep in the throat as *aw* or *ä*; the position of the organs is nearly, yet not exactly the same. The true sound can be learned only by the ear.

Equally inaccurate is the definition of the diphthong *u*, or long *u*; which these writers alledge to consist of the sounds of *e* and *oo* or *yu*. It has this sound, indeed, in certain words, as in *unite*, *union*, and others; but this is a departure from the proper sound of this character, as heard in *cube*, *abuse*, *durable*, *human*, *jury*. These words are not pronounced *kecob*, *abeoose*, *deoorable*, *heooman*, *jeoory*. The effort to introduce this affected pronunciation is of most mischievous tendency. The sound of *e* is not heard in the proper enunciation of the English *u*, and for that reason it should not be so stated on paper, nor named *yu*; as the error naturally leads to a corrupt pronunciation. Dr. Kenrick remarks, that we might as well prefix *y* to the other vowels, as to *u*, and pronounce them *ya*, *ye*, *yi*, *yo*.

But this is not the whole evil; this analysis of *u* has led orthoepists to give to our first or long *u*, two distinct sounds, or rather to make a diphthong and a vowel of this single letter. Thus they make it a diphthong in almost all situations, except after *r*, where they make it a vowel equivalent to *oo* or the French *ou*. They represent *u* as being equivalent to *ew*, that is, *e* and *oo*, in *cube*, *tube*, *duty*, *confusion*, *endure*, pronounced *kewbe*, *tewbe*, *deuty*, *confewssion*, *endewre*; but in *brute*, *fruit*, *rude*, *intrude*, *ruby*, they make *u* equivalent to *oo*; thus, *broote*, *froot*, *roode*, *introode*, *rooby*.

We know not where this affectation originated; it first appeared in Sheridan's Dictionary, but it is a most unfounded distinction, and a most mischievous error. No such distinction was known to Dr. Johnson; he gives the long *u* but one sound, as in *confusion*; and no such distinction is observed among good speakers generally.

The source of the error in this, as in another case to be mentioned hereafter, may be an inattention to the manner in which the articulations affect the vowels which follow them. To understand this, it will be necessary or useful to examine the anatomical formation of articulate sounds.

"An articulate sound," says Lowth, "is the sound of the human voice, formed by the organs of speech. A vowel is a simple articulate sound."

These definitions seem not to be sufficiently accurate. Articulation, in human speech, is the joining, juncture, or closing of the organs, which precedes and follows the vowels or open sounds, and which partially or totally intercepts the voice. A vowel or vocal sound is formed simply by opening the mouth. Thus in sounding *a* or *o*, the mouth is opened in a particular manner, but without any articulation or closing of the organs. In strictness, therefore, a simple vowel is *not* an articulate sound, as Lowth supposes; and it is certain that many irrational animals, without the power of articulation, do utter vowel sounds with great distinctness.

An articulate sound, then, is, properly, a sound preceded or followed, or both, by an articulation or junction of the organs. Thus *ba*, *ab*, and *bad*, are articulate sounds; the vowel being begun or closed, with a junction of the lips, interrupting the voice, in *ba* and *ab*; and in *bad*, the vocal sound being preceded by one articulation and followed by another. The power of articulation constitutes the great difference between men and brutes; the latter being unable to articulate, can utter only vocal sounds. The imperfect articulations of the parrot and some other animals, form no exception that deserves notice.

We give the name articulation to the act of joining the organs, and to the character or letter which represents the junction. In the latter sense, the word is equivalent to *consonant*; and articulation may be considered the preferable term, as it expresses the fact of closing the organs.

Human speech, then, consists of vocal sounds separated and modified by articulations of the organs. We open the mouth in a particular manner, to utter a vowel; we then close the organs, interrupt that sound, and open the organs to utter a second vowel; and continue this opening and closing, to the

end of the word. This process is carried on with surprising rapidity.

Now in passing from an articulation or close position, to an open position for uttering a vowel, it happens often that a very slight sound of *e* is uttered so as to be perceptible to the ear, either before or after the utterance of the proper vowel. This is remarkably the case with the long vowels preceding *r*, for such is the nature of that letter, that *bare*, *mire*, *more*, *parent*, *apparent*, &c., cannot well be pronounced without a slight sound of *e*, between the long vowel and the consonant. Thus the words above named are pronounced nearly *baer*, *mier*, *moer*, *paerent*, *appaerent*, and *bare*, *mire*, really form two syllables, though they are considered to be monosyllables.

A like case, though less obvious, occurs in uttering *u*, particularly after the labial and palatal articulations. In passing from the articulations, *eb*, *eg*, *em*, *ep*, or *pe*, to the sound of *u*, as in *mute* and *pure*, we are apt, insensibly, to utter a slight sound of *e*; and this utterance, which proceeds from the particular situation of the organs, has been mistaken for the first component sound of the diphthong *u*. The same cause has given rise to the pronunciation of *e* before the vowel in such words as *guide*, *guard*, *kind*, *guise*.

The genuine sound of *u* long, detached from the influence of consonants, is the same in all the words above specified; and the reason why it has been made a distinct vowel after *r*, as in *rude* [rood,] is, that the organs are open before the sound commences; whereas, when it follows most of our consonants, the sound is commenced immediately after an articulation, or close position of the organs, as in *mutable* and *infusion*. For this reason, *u* has more distinctly its diphthongal sound after labials and palatals, than after *r*; but this accidental circumstance should not be the ground of radical distinctions, equivalent to the sounds of different letters.

There is, in Walker's analysis of the alphabet, an error peculiar to himself. This is, in making a distinction between the short *i* when it is followed by a consonant, and when it is not; as in *ability*. In this case, he calls the first *i*, in *abil*, short; but the second he calls open, and equivalent to *e* in *equal*. (See Principles 107, 544.) He also makes the unaccented *y* at the end of a syllable, precisely like the first sound of *e* in *me*, *metre*. *Ability*, then, written according to his principles, would be *abiletee*. Never was a grosser mistake. The sound of *i* and *y* in unaccented syllables, whether followed by an articulation or not, is always the short sound of *e* long, that is, *e* shortened; the same sound in quality or kind, but not in quantity. To prove this fact, nothing is necessary but an attention to the manner in which the words *little* and *tiny* are pronounced, when they are made emphatic by utterance. They are, then, pronounced *leette*, *teeny*—and this we hear every day, not only among children, but often among adults. In this change of pronunciation, there is nothing more than a prolongation of the sound of *i*, which, in the syllables, *lit*, *tin*, is short, in *leette*, *teeny*, is long.

In consequence of this mistake, Walker has uniformly made a different notation of *i* when accented, and followed by a consonant in the same syllable, and when it stands alone in the syllable and unaccented. Thus to the first *i* in *ability* he assigns a different sound from that of the second; and in *article*, he gives to *i* the sound of *e* long, *arteecle*; but in *articular*, *articulate*, he gives it the short sound, *tik*. It is in consequence of this mistake, that he has throughout his Dictionary assigned to *i* and *y* unaccented, and to *y* unaccented terminating words, the sound of *e* long; an error, which, it is ascertained by actual enumeration, extends to more than *eleven thousand vowels* or syllables; an error, which, if carried to the full extent of his principles, would subvert all the rules of English versification. Jones and Perry have corrected this error in their notations, throughout the language.

If it should be said that Walker did not intend to direct *y* in this case, to be pronounced as *e* long, but that his notation is intended only to mark the *quality* of the sound; it may be replied, he either intended the sound to be that of *e* long, according to his express direction, or he did not. If he did, his notation is not according to any good practice, and by changing a short vowel into a long one, his notation would subvert the rules of metrical composition. If he did not, his notation is adapted to mislead the learner, and it does mislead

learners, wherever his book is strictly followed. In truth, this notation is generally condemned, and universally rejected in practice.*

In the notation of sounds, there is a mistake and inconsistency in all the orthoepists, which deserves notice, not on account of its practical importance so much, as to expose an error in syllabication or the division of words into syllables, which has been maintained by all writers in Great Britain, from time immemorial. The rule is, that "a single consonant between two vowels must be joined to the latter syllable." According to this rule, *habit*, *baron*, *tenet*, are to be divided thus, *ha-bit*, *ba-ron*, *te-net*.

This rule is wholly arbitrary, and has for ages retarded and rendered difficult the acquisition of the language by children. How is it possible that men of discernment should support a rule, that in thousands of words makes it necessary to break a syllable, detaching one of the letters essential to it, and giving it a place in the next? In the words above mentioned, *hab*, *bar*, *ten*, are distinct syllables, which cannot be divided without violence. In many words, as in these, this syllable is the radix of the word; the other syllable being formative or adventitious. But where this is not the case, convenience requires that syllables should, if possible, be kept entire; and in all cases, the division of syllables should, as far as possible, be such as to lead the learner to a just pronunciation.

As in our language the long and short vowels are not distinguished by differences of character, when we see a single consonant between vowels, we cannot determine, from the preceding vowel character, whether the sound is long or short. A stranger to the language knows not whether to pronounce *habit*, *ha-bit* or *habit*, till he is instructed in the customary pronunciation. It was probably to avoid this inconvenience, that our ancestors wrote two consonants instead of one in a great number of words, as in *banner*, *dinner*. In this respect, however, there is no uniformity in English; as we have generally retained the orthography of the languages from which we have received the words, as in *tutor*, *rigor*, *silent*, and the like.

Now it should be observed that although we often see the consonant doubled, as in *banner*, yet no more than one articulation in these cases is ever used in speaking. We close the organs but once between the first and second syllable, nor is it possible to use both the letters *n*, without pronouncing *ban*, then intermitting the voice entirely, opening the organs and closing them a second time. Hence in all cases, when the same consonant is written twice between vowels, as in *banner*, *dinner*, *better*, one of them only is represented by an articulation of the organs, the other is useless, except that it prevents any mistake as to the sound of the preceding vowel.

In the notation of all the orthoepists, there is inconsistency, at least, if not error. If they intend to express the true pronunciation by using the precise letters necessary for the purpose, they all err. For instance, they write *bar'un* for *bar'on*, when one articulation only is, or possibly can be, used; so also *ballance*, *biggot*, *biggamy*, *mellon*, *mettaphor*, *mellody*. This is not only useless, for the use of the accent after the consonant, as *bar'on*, *bal'ance*, *big'ot*, *mel'on*, &c., completely answers the purpose of determining the pronunciation; but it is contradictory to their own practice in a vast number of cases. Thus they write one consonant only in *civil*, *civic*, *river*; and Walker writes *kollonade*, doubling *l*, but *kolony*, *kolonise*, with a single *l*. This want of system is observable in all the books which are offered to the public as standards of orthoepy.

A still greater fault, because it may lead to innumerable

practical errors, consists in the notation of unaccented syllables. In this particular, there is error and discrepancy in the schemes of the orthoepists, which shows the utter impossibility of carrying them into effect. The final *y* unaccented, Walker makes to be *e* long, as we have before observed; while Sheridan, Jones, and Perry, make it equivalent to short *i*, or at least, give it a short sound, according to universal practice. Walker pronounces the last vowel in *natural* and *national*, as *a* short; Sheridan, as *e* short, *naturél*; Jones, as *u* short, *naturul*. Sheridan's notation may be a mistake, for he gives to *al* in *national*, the sound of *ul*. In the adjective, *deliberate*, Walker and Jones give *a* in the last syllable its proper long sound; and Sheridan, the sound of *e* short, *deliberet*. *Dignitary* is pronounced by Sheridan *dignitery*, and Walker and Jones give to *a* its short sound, as in *at*. The terminating syllable *ness* is pronounced by Walker and Jones *nes*, by Sheridan *nis*, as *blessednes*, *blessednis*. The same difference exists in their notation of *less*; Sheridan pronouncing it *lis*, as in *blamelis*, and Walker and Jones giving *e* its proper sound. These differences, and many others, run through their works, and appear in a large portion of all the words in the language.

Now it is probable that all these gentlemen pronounced these words alike, or so nearly alike that no difference would be noticed by a bystander. The mischief of these notations is, that attempts are made to express minute distinctions or shades of sounds, so to speak, which cannot be represented to the eye by characters. A great part of the notations must necessarily be inaccurate, and for this reason, the notation of the vowels in unaccented syllables should not be attempted. From a careful attention to this subject, we are persuaded that all such notations are useless, and many of them mischievous, as they lead to a wrong pronunciation. In no case can the true pronunciation of words in a language be accurately and completely expressed on paper; it can be caught only by the ear, and by practice. No attempt has ever been made to mark the pronunciation of all the vowels in any other language; and in our language it is worse than useless.

As Walker's pronunciation has been represented as the standard, we shall confine our remarks chiefly to his work, with a view to ascertain its merits, and correct any erroneous impressions which have been received from such representations.

1. The first class of words which we shall mention is that in which *a* has what is called its Italian sound, as we pronounce it in *father*, *psalm*, *calm*. From a hasty enumeration of words of this class, we find there are two or three hundred in number, in which Walker gives to *a* its short sound, as in *fat*, *bat*, *fancy*, when, in fact, the most respectable usage gives that letter its Italian sound. This error Jones and Perry have corrected.

2. The notation of the sound of *oo* by Walker, is wrong in most or all the words in which *oo* are followed by *k*, and in some others. Notwithstanding the distinction between the long and short sound of *oo* is clear, and well established in a great number of words, yet he assigns the short sound to eight words only, viz. *wool*, *wood*, *good*, *hood*, *foot*, *stood*, *understood*, and *withstood*. (Prin. 307.) It seems inconceivable that a man, bred or resident in London, should assign to *oo* in *book*, *cook*, *took*, and other like words, the same sound as in *cool*, *boom*, *boot*, *food*. Jones and Perry have corrected this notation, and given the pronunciation according to good usage.

3. To the letters *ch* in *bench*, *bunch*, *clinch*, *drench*, *inch*, *tench*, *wrench*, and many other words, Walker gives the French sound, that is, the sound of *sh*, instead of *ch*, as *bensch*, *insh*, &c. It would seem by this and other examples of wrong notation, that the author had been accustomed to some local peculiarities, either in London, where all kinds of dialects are heard, or in some other place. In this instance, he gives to these words a pronunciation different from that of other orthoepists.

4. It has been already remarked, that Walker's notation of the sound of *i* and *y* short, in unaccented syllables, which he directs to be pronounced like *e* long, in *me*, *mete*, is contrary to all good usage, and is rejected by every other orthoepist, except Jamieson. Walker admits *i* to be short, when followed by a consonant in the same syllable. Thus the first *i* in *ability*

* From the fact, which Walker relates of himself, (Prin. 246.) that he made a distinction between the sound of *ee* in *fee* and in *meet*, until he had consulted good speakers, and particularly Mr. Garrick, who could find no difference in the sound, it might be inferred that his ear was not very accurate. But his mistake evidently arose from not attending to the effect of the articulation in the latter word, which stops the sound suddenly, but does not vary it. It is the same mistake which he made in the sound of *i* in the second syllable of *ability*, which he calls short, while the sound of the second *i* and of *y* is that of long *e*. The celebrity of Walker as a teacher of elocution, and his key to the Pronunciation of Ancient Names, which, with a few exceptions, is a good standard work, have led many persons to put more confidence in his English Orthoepy, than a close examination of its principles will support.

is short, but the second *i* and the *y* are long *e*, *abiletee*. Now observe the consequence. In the plural, *abilities*, according to his rule, must be pronounced *abiletees*; but the word is never thus pronounced; universally it is pronounced *abilitiz*; the last vowel sound is, in practice, immediately followed by a consonant, and by his own rule, must be short. Then the result is, *y* in *ability* is long *e*, but *ie* in the plural, is short *i*. And for this change of sound, no provision is made in Walker's scheme, nor in any other that we have ever seen.

5. In the analysis of the sounds of our letters, Walker alleges the diphthong *ou*, *ow*, to consist of the broad *a*, or *aw*, and the Italian sound of *u*. According to his scheme, *about*, *abound*, *round*, *now*, *vow*, are to be pronounced *abawut*, *abawund*, *rawound*, *nawu*, *vawu*. But who ever heard this pronunciation? The fact is not so; the broad sound of *a* is not the initial sound of this diphthong; it is not commenced as deep in the throat, or with the same aperture as *aw*; it is a sound that can be learned only by the ear.

6. In noting the sound of the unaccented vowels, and those which have the secondary accent, there are mistakes without number, in all the schemes which we have seen, and one continued series of differences between the orthoepists. The following is a specimen.

Sheridan.	Walker.	Jones.
Deliverense,	Deliverause,	Deliverause.
Dignitytery,	Dignetare,	Dignitytary.
Answer,	Ansurs,	Ansurs.
Assembledzh,	Assembladje,	Assembladzhe.
Averaje,	Averaje,	Averedzh.
Barrin,	Barren,	Barrea.
Penal,	Penal,	Penul.
Pennens,	Pennanse,	Pennunse.
Pennytenshel,	Pennetenshal,	Pennytenshul.
Pennytensherry,	Pennetenshare,	Pennytenshary.
Persuiidzh,	Persunidje,	Persundje.
Proksymet,	Proksemat,	Proksymet.
Proflyget,	Prosflegat,	Prosflyget.
Pennetrent,	Pennetrant,	Pennetrant.
Akkuzaturry,	Akkuzatore,	Akkuzatury.
Akkrymunny,	Akkrenone,	Akkrymunny.
Allymunny,	Allemunne,	Allymunny.
Seremunny,	Seremone,	Serymony.

We take no notice of the different letters by which these writers express the same sound, one using *e* where another uses *y*, but of the *different sounds* which they give to the vowels in the second, third, or last syllable. Now, we appeal to any person who has a tolerably correct ear, whether it is the sound of *a* that is uttered by good speakers, or any speakers, in *deliverance* and *dignitary*? Is it the sound of *a* that we hear in the last syllable of *penance*, *penetrant*, and *assemblage*? Do we hear in the last syllable of *profligate*, the short *a*, as in *fat*? So far from it, that a public speaker, who should utter the sound of *a* so that it should be distinctly recognized in any polite audience, would expose himself to ridicule. The sound of the last vowel approaches to that of *e* or *u*, and the notation of Sheridan is nearest the truth. But any notation is worse than useless; for without it, there would be no difference in customary pronunciation.

To show the utter impracticability of expressing the unaccented vowels, in all cases, with precision, let the reader observe Walker's notation of *a* in the word *moderate*, and its derivatives. In the adjective and verb, the *a* is long, as in *fate*; in *moderately* and *moderateness* it is short, as in *fat*. This is certainly incorrect notation; no good speaker ever pronounces these words *moderattly*, *moderattness*. In addition to this, the *a* in the verb *moderate*, is more distinctly pronounced than it is in the adjective, in which it has rather the sound of *e*, short, *moderet*; at least the sound is more nearly that of *e* than of *a*. And this distinction of sound, between letters in the same word, when an adjective, and when a verb, occurs in a multitude of cases; a distinction for which no provision is made in any system of orthoepy that we have seen, and one which must be left to the cognizance of the ear alone.

There is another class of vowel sounds that comprises too
 xlii

many inaccuracies to be overlooked. This is the class in which the first syllable has an unaccented *e*, as in *debate*. In all words of this kind, Walker directs the letter *e* to have its long sound, as in *me*, *mele*. Then, *become*, *bedeck*, *begin*, *debate*, *debar*, *declare*, *elect*, *legitimate*, *mechanic*, *medicinal*, *memorial*, *necessity*, *peculiar*, *petition*, *rebuke*, *recant*, *relate*, *secure*, *select*, *velocity*, &c., are to be pronounced *becomee*, *bedeck*, *begin*, *deebate*, *deebars*, *deecclare*, *eelect*, *leegitimate*, *meechanic*, *meedieinal*, *memorial*, *neeessesity*, *peeuliar*, *peeetition*, *reebuke*, *reecant*, *reeclate*, *seecure*, *seeelect*, *veeeelocity*, &c.

According to this notation, the first vowel *e* in *evil*, *even*, and in *event*, is to have the same sound, being all marked with the same figure. Now, let us ask, where a speaker can be found who pronounces these words in this manner? Who ever heard of such a pronunciation? This notation is erroneous and mischievous, as it is inconsistent with the regular accent, which carries the stress of voice forward to the next syllable, and must, necessarily, leave the first vowel with the feeble sound of short *i* or *y*. This short sound is that which we always hear in such words.

The like error occurs in Walker's notation of *i* in *direct*, *diminish*, and many other words. Walker himself, under *despatch*, calls the sound of *e* the short *i*; but under rule 107, says this sound of *i* cannot be properly said to be *short*, as it is not closed by a consonant, yet it has half its diphthongal sound, the sound of *e*!! This reason that *i* or *e* is not short, because the sound is not closed by a consonant, is entirely groundless, and contradicted by the universal pronunciation of thousands of English words. To direct such words to be pronounced *deereet*, *deeminish*, is inexcusable. This error corresponds with that specified under No. 4. supra.

Thus, there is neither uniformity nor consistency among the orthoepists, in the notation of the unaccented vowels; and it is hardly possible there should be, for many of the sounds are so slight, in ordinary pronunciation, that it is almost impossible for the ear to recognize the distinctions, and absolutely impossible to express them on paper. In truth, as Dr. Ash remarks, in a dissertation prefixed to his Dictionary, the sounds of the five vowels, in unaccented, short, and insignificant syllables, are nearly coincident; and it must be a nice ear that can distinguish the difference of sound in the concluding syllable of *altar*, *alter*, *manor*, *murmur*, *satyr*. It is for this reason that the notation of such vowels at all savours of hypercritical fastidiousness, and by aiming at too much nicety and exactness, tends only to generate doubts and multiply differences of opinion. If the accent is laid on the proper syllable, and the vowel of that syllable correctly pronounced, the true pronunciation of the word will follow of course; at least the pronunciation is more likely to be right than wrong, and no mistake will occur, which shall be an object of notice.

Nor can we approve the practice of writing all words in different characters, to express their pronunciation, as if their proper letters were so many hieroglyphics, requiring interpretation. A great part of English words have an orthography sufficiently regular, and so well adapted to express the true pronunciation, that a few general rules only are wanted as a guide to the learner.

7. Another error of notation, in most of our English Dictionaries, is that of the vowel in the first syllable of *circle*, *circumstance*, and many other words, the first syllable of which Sheridan first, and afterwards Walker and Jones, directed to be pronounced *ser*. Perry's notation makes the syllable *sur*, according to all the usage with which we are acquainted.

8. Another objection to the books offered as standards of pronunciation, particularly to the Dictionaries of Sheridan and Walker, is that the rules are inconsistent, or the execution of the work is inconsistent with the rules.

A remarkable instance of inconsistency occurs in the following words. *Armature*, *aperture*, *breviature*, *feature*, &c., Walker pronounces *armatshure*, *apertshure*, *breviatshure*, *overshure*; but *forfeiture* is *fofeetyure*, and *judicature*, *ligature*, *literature*, *miniature*, *nunciature*, *portraiture*, *prefecture*, *quadrature*, *signature*, are pronounced as here written. Can any reason be possibly assigned for such inconsistency?

9. *Obedience* and its family of words, Walker pronounces *obejeence*, *obejeent*, *obejeently*; but *disobedience*, *disobedient*, as here written. *Expedient* is either as here written, or *expe-*

jnent; but *expedience* without the alternative. Why this inconsistency?

10. *Obdurate*, *obduracy*, are marked to be pronounced *obdurate* or *objurate*, *obduracy* or *objuracy*; but *objurately*, *objurateness*, without an alternative. In these last words occurs another error, the *a* in the third syllable is made short, as if pronounced *rat*; a deviation from all good usage.

This notation of *obdurate* is inconsistent also with that of *indurate*, and with that of *obdure*; an inconsistency which appears to have no plausible pretext.

The conversion of *d* into *j* before *i* is rejected, we believe, in all words, by Jones, Perry, and Jameson, and before *u* is rejected by Perry and Jameson, and in many words by Jones. It is a departure from orthography wholly inexcusable.

11. Walker (Principles, No. 92,) lays it down as a rule, that when *a* is preceded by the gutturals hard *g* or *c*, [he should have said palatals,] it is, in polite pronunciation, softened by the intervention of a sound like *e*, so that *card*, *cart*, *guard*, *regard*, are pronounced like *keard*, *keart*, *gheard*, *reyheard*. Now it is remarkable that in the vocabulary or dictionary, the author has departed from his rule, for in not one of the foregoing words, except *guard*, nor in a multitude of other words which fall within the rule, has he directed this sound of *e* before the following vowel. Had he conformed to his own rule, he must have perverted the pronunciation of *car*, *car-buncle*, *care*, *carcass*, *cardinal*, *cargo*, *garden*, *garter*, *discard*, and a long list of other words, too long to be here enumerated. The English orthoepists now confine this prepositive sound of *e* to *guard*, *guarantee*, *guardian*, *guile*, *kind*, and a few others. The probable origin of this fault has been already assigned, in treating of the letter *u*. It is an affected pronunciation, which Nares calls "a monster, peculiar to the stage." Indeed, this slender sound of *e* before another vowel, is wholly incompatible with that manly enunciation which is peculiarly suited to the genius of the language. Perry and Jameson have rejected it.

12. In the first edition of Walker's Dictionary, the author, under the word *tripod*, observes, that "all words of two syllables, with the accent on the first, and having one consonant between two vowels, ought to have the vowel in the first syllable long." But this was too rash, for such words as *cent'ent*, *des'ert*, *pref'ace*, *pres'ent*, *prof'it*, *reb'el*, *trop'ic*, and a multitude of others, stand, in the author's book, in direct opposition to his own rule. In a subsequent edition, the author, or some other person, has qualified the rule by an exception in favour of settled usage. This exception destroys the value of the rule; and indeed there is, and there can be, no rule applicable to words of this class. The pronunciation of the first vowel can be known only by the usage.

13. *Possess* is, by orthoepists, pronounced *pozzess*; but why not, then, pronounce *assess*, *assist*, *assassin*, *concession*, *obsession*, with the sound of *z*? Can any good reason be assigned for making *possess* an exception to the pronunciation of this class of words? This utterance of sounds through the nose is always disagreeable to the ear, and should be restricted to words in which usage is established. Good taste should rather induce a limitation, than an extension of this practice. This remark applies also to some words beginning with *dis*, in which Walker goes beyond other orthoepists in giving to *s* this nasal sound.

14. Walker lays it down as a fact, that *u* has the sound of *e* and *oo* or *yu*. This is true in many words, as in *union*, *unite*, *unanimity*, &c. Hence, according to his principle, *u* in these words is to be pronounced *yunion*, *yunite*, without the letter *y* prefixed. Yet he writes these and similar words with *y*, *yunion*, which, upon his principles, would prefix *yu* to the sound of *yu*, and the pronunciation would be *yuyunite*, or *eooyunite*. But his notation of this sound of *u* is not uniform; for he writes *disunion* and *disunite* without *y*, though it must be as proper in the compound as in the simple word. The same inconsistency occurs between *use*, written, *yuse*, *yuze*, and *disuse*, *disuze*.

15. There is a fault in Walker's notation of *o*, when it has the sound of *oo*, the French *ou*. In the Key, he marks *o*, when it has this sound, with the figure 2, and gives *move* as an example. Then according to his Key, *o* alone when thus marked, sounds as *oo*. But in the Vocabulary, he thus marks

both vowels in *book*, *look*, *boot*, and all similar words. Then according to his notation, each of the vowels has the sound of *oo*, and *book*, *look*, are to be pronounced *boo-ook*, *loo-ook*. He certainly did not intend this; but such is precisely his direction, or the result of his notation; and a foreigner, without counter-direction, must be led into this pronunciation.

The same fault occurs in his notation of *ee*, as in *meet* and *seek*.

16. *Volume*, Walker and Jones pronounce *vol्यूme*; why not then change *column* into *col्यूm*? Will it be said that in *volume* the *u* is long? This is not the fact; at least, we never heard it thus pronounced; it is always short in common usage, and so marked by Perry.

17. *Ink*, *uncle*, *concord*, *concourse*, *concubine*, are pronounced by Walker, *ingk*, *ungkl*, *kongkord*, *kongkorse*, *kongkubine*; and these odious vulgarisms are offered for our adoption. There can be no apology for such attempts to corrupt our language.

18. The words *bravery*, *finery*, *knavery*, *nicely*, *scenery*, *slavery*, are by Walker, and the other orthoepists, pronounced in three syllables, and *imagery* in four; the final *e* of the primitive word being detached from it, and uttered with *r*, as a distinct syllable. Why *savagery* has escaped the same fate, we do not know. It is obvious that in negligent practice, these words have often been thus pronounced. But the most correct pronunciation retains the original word entire in the derivative, the slight sound of *e* before *r*, no more constituting a syllable, than it does in *more* and *mire*. Take the following examples.

Of marble stone was cut	
An altar carv'd with cunning <i>imagery</i> .	<i>Spenser.</i>
When in those oratories might you see	
Rich carvings, portraitures, and <i>imagery</i> .	<i>Dryden.</i>
Your gift shall two large goblets be	
Of silver, wrought with curious <i>imagery</i> .	<i>Id.</i>
What can thy <i>imagery</i> of sorrow mean?	<i>Prior.</i>

Pronounced in four syllables, *imagery*, in these lines, makes a syllable too much, and injures the measure, and in the last example utterly destroys it.

19. Formerly, the words *puissance*, *puissant*, had the accent on the second syllable; although the poets seem, in some instances, to have blended the four first letters into one syllable. But the modern change of the accent to the first syllable is not in accordance with English analogies, and it impairs the measure of many lines of poetry, in which these words occur. In the adverb *puissantly*, it has a very bad effect.

The foregoing observations extend to whole classes of words, in which the genuine pronunciation has been changed, unsettled, and perverted. It would be inconsistent with the limited nature of this Introduction, to enter into an examination of every particular word of disputable pronunciation. It seems to be inexpedient and useless to bestow, as Walker has done, half a page or a page, on a single word, in attempting to settle some trifling point, or, in many cases, to settle a point that has never been disputed.

In proportion as the importance of settled usages and of preserving inviolate the proper sounds of letters, as the true and only safe landmarks of pronunciation, shall be appreciated by an enlightened people, just in that proportion will all attempts of affected speakers to innovate upon such established usages be reprobated and resisted.

The intentions of the men who have undertaken to give a standard of pronunciation, have, unquestionably, been upright and sincere; but facts have proved that instead of *good*, they have, on the whole, done *harm*; for instead of reducing the pronunciation of words to uniformity, they have, to a considerable extent, unsettled it, and multiplied differences.

Some of the differences of notation in the several books may be rather *apparent* than *real*; but with all due allowance for this imperfection of the schemes, we are persuaded that there are *ten* differences among these orthoepists, where there is *one* in the actual pronunciation of respectable people in England; and in most of them the notation, if strictly followed, will lead

to *ten* differences of pronunciation, where *one* only now exists in actual practice.

This effect of multiplying doubts and diversities has resulted from very obvious causes.

1. The limited acquaintance of orthoepists with the general usage, and their taking the pronunciation of London, or some dialect or local practice in that city, for the *best usage*. The propagation of such a dialectical or peculiar practice would of course disturb the uniformity of any other practice in other parts of England.

2. The difficulty or rather impracticability of representing sounds, and nice distinctions of sound, on paper; especially in unaccented syllables.

3. The partiality of authors for the practice of particular speakers, either stage players or others, which would lead them to denominate that the *best* practice which had been adopted by their favourites.

4. A spirit of fastidious hypercriticism, which has led writers to make minute distinctions, that are liable to be disputed, and which tend only to perplex the inquirer, and generate uncertainty or diversity, where no essential difference had previously existed in practice. This spirit is continually producing new books and new schemes of orthoepy, and every additional book serves only to increase the difficulty of uniting opinions and establishing uniformity.

This view of the subject is probably the most favourable that can be presented. The real fact seems to be this; these men have taken for the standard, what they were pleased to call the *best usage*, which, in many cases, is a local usage or some favourite peculiarity of particular speakers, at least if they have had any authority at all; or they have given the pronunciation which happened to please their fancy, though not authorized by usage. In this manner they have attempted to bend the common usage to their particular fancies.

It has been in this manner, by presenting to the public *local* or *particular* practice, or mere innovation, for a standard, instead of general or national usage, that the authors above mentioned have unsettled the pronunciation of many words, and multiplied diversities of practice. These attempts to obtrude *local usage* on the public, and bend to it the general or national usage, are the boldest assumptions of authority in language that the history of literature has ever exhibited.

The English language, when pronounced according to the genuine composition of its words, is a nervous, masculine language, well adapted to popular eloquence; and it is not improbable that there may be some connection between this manly character of the language and the freedom of the British constitution. They may, perhaps, act and react upon each other mutually, as cause and effect, and each contribute to the preservation of the other. At the same time, the language is, by no means, incapable of poetical sweetness and melody. The attempts to refine upon the pronunciation, within the last half century, have, in our opinion, added nothing to its smoothness and sweetness, but have very much impaired its strength of expression as well as its regularity. The attempts to banish the Italian sound of *a*, and to introduce the sound of *e* before *i* and *u*, as in *kind*, *guard*, *duty*, &c., ought to be resisted, as injurious to the manly character of the genuine English pronunciation.

In order to produce and preserve a tolerable degree of uniformity and the genuine purity of our language, two things appear to be indispensable, viz.

1. To reject the practice of noting the sounds of the vowels in the unaccented syllables. Let any man, in genteel society or in public, pronounce the distinct sound of *a* in the last syllable of *important*, or the distinct sound of *e* in the terminations *less* and *ness*, as in *hopeless*, *happiness*, and he would pass for a most inelegant speaker. Indeed, so different is the slight sound of a great part of the unaccented vowels, in elegant pronunciation, from that which is directed in books of orthoepy, that no man can possibly acquire the nicer distinction of sounds by means of books; distinctions which no characters yet invented can express. Elegant pronunciation can be learned only by the ear. The French and Italians, whose languages are so popular in Europe, have never attempted to teach the sounds of their letters by a system of notation, embracing the finer sounds of the vowels.

sliv

2. To preserve purity and uniformity in pronunciation, it is necessary to banish from use all books which change the orthography of words, to adapt the pronunciation to the fashion of the day. The scheme now pursued is the most mischievous project for corrupting the language that human ingenuity ever devised. By removing the landmarks of language, all the fences which can secure the purity and regularity of the language from unlicensed depredations without end are demolished, the chief use and value of alphabetical writing are destroyed, and every thing is given to chance and to caprice.

ETYMOLOGY.

Irregular as is the orthography of the English language, and unsettled or corrupt as is the pronunciation, there is nothing either in English or in any other language of which we have any knowledge, which exhibits so strikingly the low state of philology, as the etymological deductions of words, or the history of their origin, affinities, and primary signification. To enable the young inquirer to estimate the erudition, correctness, or negligence of writers on this subject, and to awaken more attention to this branch of learning, we will state briefly the results of our researches, and the opinions which we have been compelled to form on the merits of the principal treatises on this subject.

The first example of etymology which we shall mention is that of Josephus, the historian of the Jews, who informs his readers, that the first man "was called *Adam*, which, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies one that is *red*, because he was formed out of *red earth* compounded together; for of that kind is virgin and true earth." Here is a mistake proceeding from a mere resemblance of words; it being certain that *Adam* no more signifies *red earth*, than it does *red cedar*. This mistake is connected with another, that *Adam* was the proper name of the first man, an individual; whereas the word is the generic name of the human species, and like *man* in English, signifies form, shape, image, expressing distinctively the characteristic eminence or distinction of form of the human race. This fact explains the use of the plural pronoun, in the account of the creation of the species. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let *them* have dominion over the fish of the sea," &c.; Gen. i. 26. It is evident, also, that the words used in relation to the species, the *image*, the *likeness* of God, have reference, not only to their intellectual and moral faculties, but also to their external form; and so the apostle interprets the words, 1 Cor. xi. 7. Not that God has any bodily shape of which man can be the image, but that man has a superior or super-excellent form, corresponding to his intellectual powers, and distinguishing him from all other animals. Now the mistake of Josephus has infected the Christian world for eighteen hundred years, and the mistake, with erroneous inferences from it, enters into the most recently published systems of theology.

Among the most celebrated authors of antiquity, who have written on the subject of language, is Varro, who has left a treatise *De Lingua Latina*. On this author's learning, Cicero, Quintilian, and Augustine have bestowed the most unbounded praises. He is pronounced to have been *vir egregius*; *eruditissimus Romanorum*; *peritissimus lingue Latinæ et omnis antiquitatis*, sine ulla dubitatione, *doctissimus*.^{*} He was, doubtless, a man of uncommon erudition for the age in which he lived; and his etymological treatise may be consulted with advantage by persons who have knowledge enough of this subject to separate the *certain* or *probable* from the *improbable* and *conjectural*. But it is certain from what remains of his treatise, that his knowledge of the origin of words did not extend beyond the most obvious facts and principles. Thus he deduces *initium* from *ineo*; *exitus* from *ex eo*; *victoria* from *vinco*. All this is well; and we have reason to think him correct in deducing *vellus*, fleece, from *vellere*, to pluck, as, doubtless, fleeces were plucked from sheep before the use of shears. And we have reason to believe him when he informs

^{*} Of the full value of these encomiums we can hardly judge, as most of Varro's writings have perished, and some of those which survive appear in a mutilated form. But the greater his erudition, the more striking will appear his ignorance of this subject.

us that *imber* was originally written *himber*; that *hircus* was written by the Sabines *ircus*, and *hædus*, *jædus*.

Very different must be our opinion of the following etymologies.

Pater, says Varro, is from *patefacio*; *ager cultus* is so called because in it seeds coalesce or unite with the earth; referring *ager*, perhaps, to the root of *aggr*, or the Greek *αγρῶν*. *Campus*, he says, was so named because fruits were first gathered from the open field, deducing the word from *capio*. Next to this, were the hills, *colles*, so named *colendo*, from *colo*, because these were cultivated next to the open plain. That land or field which appeared to be the foundation of cattle and money, was called *fundus*, or it was so called because it pours forth [*fundat*] annual crops. He deduces *cogitare* from *cogendo*; *concilium* from *cogitatione*; *cura* from *burning cor*, the heart; *volo* from *voluntas*, and *a volatu*, a flying, because the mind flies instantly whither it will. How low must have been the state of philology, when such improbable conjectures as these could attract the encomiums before mentioned, from Cicero and Quinctilian!

The reader will find many things in Isidore and Priscian worthy of his attention, though much of what their works contain is now so familiar to scholars of moderate attainments as scarcely to repay the labour of perusal. But he who learns that Isidore makes *oratio*, a compound of *oris ratio*; *nomen*, a contraction of *notamen*; and that he derives *verbum* from *verberato aere*, will hardly think it worth his labour to pursue his researches into that author's works. Nor will he be disposed to relish Priscian's deduction of *litera* from *legilitera*, because a letter affords the means of reading, or from *lituro*, to obliterate, because the ancients used to write on wax tables, and afterwards to obliterate what they had written.

Vossius wrote a folio on the etymology of Latin words; but from repeated examinations of his book, we are persuaded that most of his deductions are far-fetched, conjectural, and fanciful; many of them are certainly erroneous.

Menage and Minshew we have not consulted; chiefly because from such extracts as we have seen, from their writings, we are certain that little reliance can be placed on their opinions, except in cases too plain to be mistaken.

Junius and Skinner, the authorities for most of the etymologies of Bailey and Johnson, are sufficiently correct in referring English words to the language from which they are immediately derived, especially when the orthography is too plain to be mistaken. They inform us that *father* is from the Saxon *fæder*, that *drop* is from the Saxon *droppan*, that *picket* is from the French *piquet*, and the like. So Johnson informs us that *accent* is from the Latin *accentus*, and *accept* from the French *accepter*, Latin *accipio*. All this is well, but it can hardly be called etymology, or the deduction of words from their originals.

Whiter, in his *ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM*, the first volume only of which we have perused, began his work on a good plan, that of bringing together words of the same or of cognate radical letters, and in pursuance of his plan he has collected many real affinities. But he has destroyed the value of his work by mistaking the radical sense of many words, and by confounding words of different elements.

Jamieson, in his *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, has collected the affinities of words in that language, particularly words of Gothic and Teutonic origin, with industry, and probably with judgment, and a good degree of accuracy. In some instances, we think, he has departed from correct principles of etymology, and mistaken facts, and he, as well as Whiter, falls very short of truth in a most important particular, a clear understanding of the primary sense of words. Jamieson's Dictionary, however, contains a valuable addition to our stock of etymological materials.

To Horne Tooker we are indebted for the first explanation of certain indeclinable words, called conjunctions and prepositions; and for this let him have all merited praise. But his researches were very limited, and he has fallen into most material errors, particularly in his second volume.

The *HERMES* of Harris, according to Dr. Lowth, "is the most beautiful and perfect example of analysis that has been exhibited since the days of Aristotle." This, in our opinion, is not the character of the work, which, for the most part,

consists of passages from the works of Aristotle, Ammonius, Apollonius, Priscian, and other grammarians. It is little more than a collection of the opinions of the ancient writers on philology, whose metaphysical subtleties rather obscure than illustrate the subject. To show how easily men may be misled by metaphysics, when applied to the plainest subject imaginable, take the following example from the *Hermes*.

"A respects our *primary* perception, and denotes individuals as *unknown*; the respects our *secondary* perception, and denotes individuals as *known*." [This is nearly a literal translation of a passage in Priscian, lib. 17.]

To illustrate the truth of this observation, the author gives the following example. "There goes a beggar with a long beard"—indicating that the man had not been seen before; and, therefore, *a* denotes the primary perception. A week after the man returns, and I say, "There goes the beggar with the long beard;" the article *the* here indicating the secondary perception, that is, that the man had been seen before. All this is very well. But let us try the rule by other examples, and see whether it is universal, or whether it is the peculiar and proper office of *an* or *a* to denote primary perception.

"The article *a*," says Harris, "leaves the individual *unascertained*." Let us examine this position.

"But Peter took him, saying, Stand up; I myself also am *a* man." Now, according to Harris, *a* here denotes the *primary* perception, and the individual is *unascertained*. That is, this man is one I have never seen before.

"He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Whether *a*, in this sentence, denotes first perception, I cannot determine; but sure I am the individual is not left *unascertained*.

A. B. says to me, "I have lately dismissed an old servant, who has lived with me for thirty years." Here *a* may present a primary perception to the hearer, but not so to the speaker. To both, the individual must be well *ascertained*.

It appears, then, that this definition of *an* or *a* is incorrect, and the pains of these metaphysical writers who form such *perfect analyses* of language is little better than *learned trifling*. On testing the real character of *an* or *a* by usage and facts, we find it is merely the adjective *one*, in its Saxon orthography, and that its sole use is to denote *one*, whether the individual is known or unknown, definite or indefinite.

Again, Harris translates and adopts the definition which Aristotle has given of a conjunction. "An articulate sound or part of speech devoid of signification by itself, but so formed as to help signification, by making two or more significant sentences to be one significant sentence."

This is so far from being true, that some of the conjunctions are verbs, equivalent to *join*, *unite*, or *add*, in the imperative mood. In like manner, the prepositions called inseparable, and used as prefixes, are all significant *per se*, although by custom they sometimes lose their appropriate use. For example, *re*, which denotes repetition, has lost its use in *recommend*, which is equivalent to *commend*, without the sense of repetition. But still it has ordinarily an appropriate sense, which is perfectly understood, even when first prefixed to a word. Let any person prefix this word to *pronounce* for the first time, and direct a boy fourteen years old to *repronounce* his oration, and he would perfectly well understand the direction.

Bryant, the author of "An Analysis of Ancient Mythology," has given to the public a history of the Cuthites or descendants of Ham, a race of bold adventurers, who, as he supposes, made expeditions by sea and land, introducing arts, founding cities, and corrupting religion by the propagation of Sabianism. For proof of his opinions, he relies very much on etymology and the signification of names. Two or three examples of his deductions will be sufficient to show his manner of proof. *Ham* or *Cham*, signifying heat and the sun, he deduces from חם, to be hot, to heat. So far he may be correct. But he goes on to deduce from this root, also, as *Castle* had done before him, the Greek *καύμα*, heat, not considering that this is from καίω, to burn, in which *m* is not radical, but probably *s* is the radical consonant, as this occurs in the derivatives. *Καύμα* has no connection with *Ham*. From *Cam* or *Cham* he then deduces the Latin *camera*, Gr. *καμάρα*, an arched roof or vault, whence our *chamber*, though it is not easy to discover

the connection between this word and heat; and from the same root he deduces *Camillus*, *Camilla*, and many other words, without any support for his opinions, but a mere similarity of orthography in the first syllable. In all this he is certainly wrong.

The Greek *Θεός*, God, he supposes, most unwarrantably, to be formed from the Egyptian *Theuth* or *Thoth*, Mercury.

The sun he supposes to have been styled *El-uc*; *El* [אֱלֹהִים] and *uc* or *och*, a title of honour among the Babylonians. This word, says Bryant, the Greeks changed into *λύκος*, [a wolf], and hence the Latin *lux*, *luceo*. A strange conjecture this, not to call it by a harsher name. Now, if Bryant had examined the Teutonic dialects, and the Welsh, he would have seen his mistake; for the Saxon *leoht*, *liht*, Dutch and German *licht*, are from the common root of the Welsh *llug*, a shooting or gleaming, *lluciao*, to throw, *lluc*, a darting or flashing, the root of *luceo*; a simple root, that can have no connection with *El-uc*.

Excepting Faber's work on the Cabiri, we have seen scarcely a book in any language, which exhibits so little etymological knowledge, with such a series of erroneous or fanciful deductions, as Bryant's *Analysis*. Drummond's *Origines* abounds with etymological deductions of a similar character.

Gebelin, a French writer, in his *Monde Primitif*, has bestowed much labour in developing the origin and signification of words; but a large part of his labour has produced no valuable effect. His whole system is founded on a mistake, that the noun is the root of all other words.

Of all the writers on etymology, whose works we have read or consulted, Spelman and Llyud are almost the only ones in whose deductions much confidence can be placed. We do not name Camden, Hickes, Selden, and Gibson, as their etymological inquiries, though generally judiciously conducted, were very limited. This is true, also, in some degree, of Spelman and Llyud; but the researches of Spelman into the origin of law terms, and words of the middle ages, have generally produced very satisfactory results. From the limited nature of the designs of Spelman and Llyud, errors may have occasionally escaped them; but they are few, and very pardonable.

We know of no work in any language, in which words have been generally traced to their original signification, with even tolerable correctness. In a few instances, this signification is too obvious to be mistaken; but in most instances, the ablest etymologist is liable to be misled by first appearances, and the want of extensive investigation.

A principal source of mistakes on this subject, is a disregard of the identity of the radical consonants, and a licentious blending and confounding of words, whose elementary letters are *not commutable*. Another source of error is an unwarrantable license in prefixing or inserting letters, for the purpose of producing an identity or resemblance of orthography; a fault very justly opposed by Sir William Jones.

The learned Dr. Good, in his *Book of Nature*, Lecture IX. of the second series, suggests it to be probable that both *papa* and *fater*, issued from the Hebrew source, אָב אֵם עָלָם. He then fearlessly ventures to affirm, that there is scarcely a language or dialect in the world, polished or barbarous, in which the same idea is not expressed by the radical of one or the other of these terms. True, the letter א is found in most words of this signification; although our knowledge of languages is too limited to warrant such a broad assertion. But the attempt to deduce all words signifying *fater*, from the Hebrew, must certainly fail; for we know from history, that a great part of Asia and of Europe was inhabited before the existence of the Hebrew nation. Besides, a large portion of the European population have no word for *fater*, which can be rationally deduced from אָב. The Welsh *tad*, whence our *daddy*, the Gothic *atta*, Irish *athair*, Basque *aita*, and Laponic *atki*, cannot be formed from the Hebrew word, the letter *d* and *t* not being commutable with *b*. One would suppose that a learned physiologist could not fail to assign the true cause of the similarity of words bearing the sense of *fater* and *mother*, among the nations of the earth. The truth is, the sound of *a* is very easy, and probably the easiest for children, being formed by simply opening the mouth, without any exertion of the organs to modulate the sound. So, also, the articulations *b*, *m*, and *d* or *t*, being natural and easy, will gene-

alvi

rally enter into the first words formed by children. The labials are formed by simply closing the lips, and the dentals, by placing the tongue against the root of the upper teeth; the position which it naturally occupies in a healthy child. From these circumstances, we may fairly infer, *a priori*, that such words as *ab*, *aba*, *papa*, *tad*, *mamma*, must be the first words uttered by children. Indeed, were the whole human race to lose their present names for *father*, *mother*, and *nurse*, similar names would be formed by a great portion of mankind, without any communication between different nations.

The author further observes, that the generic terms for the Deity are chiefly the three following, *Al* or *Allah*, *Theus* or *Deus*, and *God*. "Besides these, there is scarcely a term of any kind, by which the Deity is designated, in any part of the world, whether among civilized or savage men. Yet these proceed from the same common quarter of the globe." True; men, and of course words, all came from a common quarter of the globe. But it so happens, that these three terms must have originated among different families, or from different sources, for they are all formed with different radicals, and can have had no connection with a common radix. But it happens, also, that not one of these terms, as far as we can learn, exists among the Slavonic nations, who compose a large portion of all the population of Europe, and whose name of God is *Bog*, a word radically distinct from all which the author has mentioned.

The author proceeds to say, "that the more common etymon for *death*, among all nations, is *mor*, *mort* or *mut*." But if either of these terms for *death*, is a native word among the great Gothic, Teutonic, and Slavonic families, which constitute the half or two thirds of all the inhabitants of Europe, we have not been able to find it. Besides *mor* and *mut* are words radically distinct, and thus originated in different families.

"*Sir*," says the author, "is, in our language, the common title of respect; and the same term is employed in the *same sense throughout every quarter of the globe*. In the Sanscrit and Persian, it means the *organ of the head itself*." He finds the word in Arabia, Turkey, in Greek, among the Peruvians in South America, in Germany, Holland, and the contiguous countries. In some of the languages of these countries we have found no such word; but if it exists, the author's inference, that the *name of the head* gave rise to this term of respect, (for this is what we understand him to mean), is totally unfounded; and equally fanciful and unfounded is his supposition, that, by the loss of *h* from *sher*, the pronoun *her*, and the German *herr*, lord, are to be deduced from *sir*. In all this it is demonstrably certain there is no truth or even semblance of reality.

Man, the author deduces from the Hebrew אָדָם to discern or discriminate, [a sense we do not find in the Lexicons,] and hence he infers that the radical idea of *man* is that of a *thinking* or a *reasonable being*. With this word he connects *Menu*, *Menes*, *Minos*, and *μῆνος*, *mens*, *mind*; a sweeping inference made at random, from a similarity of orthography, without a distant conception of the true primary meaning of either of these words. But what is worse, he appears, if we do not mistake his meaning, to connect with these words the *tane*, *tanato*, or *tangi*, of the Sandwich Isles; words which are formed with a radical initial consonant, not convertible with *m*, and most certainly unconnected with *man*. See the words *FATHER*, *MAN*, and *SIR*, in the Dictionary.

The author offers some other etymologies and affinities equally remote from truth, and even from probability.

The governing principles of etymology are, *first*, the identity of radical letters, or a coincidence of cognates, in different languages; no affinity being admissible, except among words whose primary consonants are articulations of the same organs, as *B*, *F*, *M*, *P*, *V* and *W*; or as *D*, *T*, *Th* and *S*; or as *G*, *C* close, *K* and *Q*; *R*, *L* and *D*. Some exceptions to this rule must be admitted, but not without collateral evidence of the change, or some evidence that is too clear to be reasonably rejected.

Second. Words in different languages are not to be considered as proceeding from the same radix, unless they have the same signification, or one closely allied to it, or naturally deducible from it. And on this point, much knowledge of the primary sense of words, and of the manner in which collateral

accuses have sprung from one radical idea, is necessary to secure the inquirer from mistakes. A competent knowledge of this branch of etymology cannot be obtained from any one, or from two or three languages. It is almost literally true, that in examining more than twenty languages, we have found *each* language to throw some light on *every other*.

That the reader may have more clear and distinct ideas of what is intended by *commutable letters*, and the principles by which etymological deductions are to be regulated, it may be remarked that *commutable* or *interchangeable letters* are letters of the *same organs*; that is, letters or articulations formed by the same parts of the mouth. Thus, *b, m* and *p*, are formed immediately by the lips, the position of which is slightly varied to make the distinction between these letters. *P* and *v* are formed by the lips, but with the aid of the upper teeth. Now the difference of the jointings of the organs to utter these letters is so small, that it is easy for men, in utterance, to slide from one form into another.

The following examples will illustrate this subject.

Labial letters commuted for other labials.

English *bear*, Lat. *fero*, *pario*, G. *φέρω*, *φορέω*, D. *voeren*, G. *führen*.

Here is the same word written in different languages with five different initial letters.

German *wahr*, true, L. *verus*.

Celtic *lamh*, *law*, the hand, Goth. *lofa*.

L. *guberno*, Fr. *gouverner*, Eng. *govern*.

Dental letters commuted for other dentals.

Eng. *dew*, G. *thau*.

Eng. *good*, G. *gut*.

Eng. *dare*, Gr. *θάρσσω*.

Eng. *day*, G. *tag*.

Eng. *thank*, D. *dancken*.

Eng. *brother*, D. *broeder*.

Palatal letters commuted for other palatals.

Eng. *call*, W. *gallo*, Gr. *καλέω*.

Eng. *get*, It. *callare*.

Greek, *καίω*, L. *hiems*, winter.

Dentals converted into sibilants.

Eng. *water*, G. *wasser*.

Lat. *dens*, a tooth, G. *zahn*.

Eng. *let*, Fr. *laisser*.

Ch. *כִּית*, Heb. *כִּיש*.

Sax. *tid*, time, G. *zeit*.

Change of linguals.

Eng. *escort*, Sp. and Port. *escorta*.

Fr. *blanc*, white, Port. *branco*.

Change of *f* into *h*.

Sp. *habla* for Lat. *fabula*; *haz* for *facies*, *face*; *hacer* for *facio*.

It is believed that *n* and *s* are sometimes convertible; as in Latin *pono*, *posui*, and also *r* and *s*, as in English *iron*, German *isen*.

Letters formed by different organs are not commutable; hence we are not to admit a radical word beginning or ending with *b, f*, or *v*, to be the same as a word beginning or ending with *g, d, t, r*, or *s*; nor a word whose radical letters are *m, n*, to be the same as one whose elements are *r, d*, or *c, t*. If such words are in any case the same, they must have suffered some anomalous changes; changes which are very unusual, and which are never to be admitted without the clearest evidence.

ACCENTUATION.

Accent is the more forcible utterance of a particular syllable of a word, by which it is distinguished from the others. The accented syllable of a word serves, therefore, as a kind of resting place or support of the voice, which passes over the unaccented syllables with more rapidity and a less distinct utterance.

Accent is of two kinds, or rather of two degrees of force, *primary* and *secondary*. Words of one syllable can have no accent. Words of two syllables have the primary accent only. Words of three and four syllables may have the primary and secondary accent; but many of them have no secondary accent that deserves notice; such are *dignity*, *enemy*, *annuity*, *fidelity*. In words of four, five, or more syllables, a secondary accent is often essential to a clear, distinct articulation of the several syllables. Thus *heterogeneous* cannot be well uttered without two accented syllables; the fourth syllable receiving the principal stress of the voice, and the first clearly distinguished by more forcible utterance than the second, third, fifth, and sixth.

The accent of most English words has been long established, and, evidently, it has been determined by the natural ease of speaking, without the aid of rules or instruction. If any man should ask, why we lay the accent of such words as *elocation*, *meditation*, *relation*, *congratulation*, on the last syllable except one; the answer is, that such accentuation renders the pronunciation more easy to the organs of speech, and more agreeable to the ear, than the accentuation of any other syllable. The ease of speaking, and a kind of prosaic melody, resulting from a due proportion of accented and unaccented syllables, which enables the speaker to bound with ease from one accented syllable to another, without omitting those which are unaccented, are the two great principles by which the accentuation of words has been regulated. And it is to be extremely regretted that these principles should, in any instances, be neglected, or forced to yield to arbitrary reasons of derivation, or to a pedantic affectation of foreign pronunciation. When we know that the great mass of a nation naturally fall into a particular manner of pronouncing a word, without any rule or instruction, we may rely upon this tendency as a pretty certain indication that their accentuation is according to the analogies of the language, by which their habits of speaking have been formed; and this tendency cannot be opposed without doing violence to those analogies and to national habits.

Thus, formerly, the word *horizon* was universally accented on the first syllable, and this accentuation was according to the settled analogy of the language. But the early poets had a fancy for conforming the English to the Greek pronunciation, and accented the second syllable; the orthoepists followed them; and now we have this forced, unnatural pronunciation of the learned, in collision with the regular, analogous, popular pronunciation. By this affectation of the Greek accent, the flowing smoothness of the word is entirely lost.

In like manner, an imitation of the French pronunciation of *confesseur* and *successeur*, led the early poets to accent the English words on the first syllable, in violation of analogy and euphony; and some orthoepists affect to follow them; but public usage frowns on this affectation, and rejects their authority.

There are many words in the English language, indeed a large part of the whole number, which cannot be reduced under any general rule of accentuation, as the exceptions to any rule formed will be nearly as numerous as the words which the rule embraces. And, in most instances, we shall find in the structure of the words satisfactory reasons for the difference of pronunciation.

DISSYLLABLES.

No general rule can be given for the accentuation of words of two syllables. It is, however, worth observing, that when the same word is both a noun, or an adjective and a verb, it happens, in many instances, that the noun or adjective has the accent on the first syllable, and the verb on the last. Instances of which we have in *ab'sent*, to *absent*; *con'cert*, to *concert*; *ex'port*, to *export*. The reason is, the preterite and participles of the verbs require to have the same syllable accented as the verb; but if the first syllable of the preterite and participles were to be accented, it would be difficult to pronounce the words, as may be perceived by attempting to pronounce *ab'senting*, *con'certed*, *con'ducted*, with the accent on the first syllable.

In a few instances, the word has a different accent when a noun, from that which it has when an adjective; as *Aug'ust*, *august*; *gallant*, *ga'liant*.

TRISYLLABLES.

Words of three syllables, derived from dissyllables, usually retain the accent of their primitives. Thus,

Poet, poetess; plead ant, plead antly; gracious, graciously; relâte, relâted; polt'le, polt'lest.

In like manner, words of four syllables, formed from dissyllables, generally retain the accent of the primitives; as in *collect'ible*, from *collect'*, *ser'viceable*, from *ser'vice*.

In all cases, the preterite and participles of verbs retain the accent of the verbs.

Words ending in *tion, sion, tian, cious, tious, cial, cian, tial, tiate, tient, cient*, have the accent on the syllable preceding that termination; as *motion, Christian, precious, erudition, patient, &c.*

Words of more than two syllables, ending in *ty*, have, for the most part, the accent on the antepenult; as *gratuity, propriety, prosperity, insensibility.*

Trisyllables ending in *ment*, for the most part, have the accent on the first syllable, as *compliment, detriment*; but to this rule there are many exceptions, and particularly nouns formed from verbs, as *amendment, commandment.*

Words with the following terminations, have the accent on the last syllable except two, or antepenult.

- fluous, as *super'fluous, mellif'luous.*
- ferous, as *buccif'erous, argentif'erous.*
- fluent, as *circum'fluent.*
- cracy, as *demo'cracy, theo'cracy.*
- gonal, as *diag'onal, serag'onal.*
- gony, as *cosmog'ony, theo'gony.*
- macy, as *logom'acy, theom'archy.*
- loquy, as *ob'loquy, ventril'oquy.*
- mathy, as *polym'athy.*
- meter, as *barom'eter, hygrom'eter.*
- nomy, as *econ'omy, astron'omy.*
- ogy, as *philol'ogy, cosmol'ogy.*
- pathy, as *ap'athy, antip'athy.*
- phony, as *eu'phony, sym'phony.*
- parous, as *orip'arous, virip'arous.*
- scopy, as *deuteros'copy, aëros'copy.*
- strophe, as *apostrophe, catas'trophe.*
- tamous, as *ignis'tamous.*
- vorous, as *carniv'orous, graminiv'orous.*
- tomy, as *anal'omy, lithol'omy.*
- raphy, as *geog'raphy, orthog'raphy.*

Compound words, as *book-case, ink-stand, pen-knife, note-book*, usually have a slight accent, that is, one syllable is distinguished by some stress of voice; but as the other syllable is significant by itself, it is uttered with more distinctness than the syllables of other words which are wholly unaccented. And in some words there are two accents, one on each component part of the word, which are barely distinguishable. Thus in *legislative, legislator, legislature*, the accent on the first syllable can hardly be distinguished from that on the third; and if a speaker were to lay the primary accent on the third syllable, his pronunciation would hardly be noticed as a singularity. Indeed there are some compound words, in which there is so little distinction of accent, that it is deemed unnecessary to mark either syllable or part of the word as accented.

As to a great part of English words, their accent must be learned from dictionaries, elementary books, or practice. There is no method of classification, by which they can be brought under a few simple general rules, to be easily retained by the memory; and attempts to effect this object must only burden the memory, and perplex the learner.

The differences in the accentuation of words, either in books or in usage, are not very numerous. In this respect, the language is tolerably well settled, except in a few words. Among these are *acceptable, commendable, confessor, successor, receptacle, receptory, deceptory, dyspepsy*, which the orthoepists incline to accent on the first syllable. But with regard to most of these words, their accentuation is contrary to common usage, and with regard to all of them, it ought to be rejected. The ease of pronunciation requires the

accent to be on the second syllable, and no effort to remove it can ever succeed.

The words *accessory, desultory, exemplary, and peremptory*, would all have the accent on the second syllable, were it not very difficult, with this accent, to articulate the three last syllables of the derivatives, *accessorily, desultorily, exemplarily, peremptorily*. It is for this reason that the primary accent is laid on the first syllable, and then a secondary accent on the third enables the speaker to articulate distinctly and with tolerable ease the last syllables. If the primary accent is laid on the second syllable, there can be no secondary accent. Yet the natural accent of the primitives being on the second syllable of the three first, and the derivatives little used, we find good speakers often lay the accent on the second syllable, nor is it easy to change the practice.

It is further to be observed that there are some words which, in poetry and prose, must be differently accented, as the accent has been transferred by usage from one syllable to another within the two last centuries. Nares enumerates more than a hundred words, whose accent has been thus changed since the age of Shakspeare. Of this class of words are *aspect, balcony, process, sojourn, convez, contest, retinue, converse*, the adjective *acceptable*, which Milton accents on the first syllable, as he does the verbs *attribute* and *contribute*. But the accent of all these words has been changed; the eight first have the accent indisputably on the first syllable; the two last, on the second syllable.

OF JOHNSON'S DICTIONARY, AND OF THE MANNER IN WHICH THE FOLLOWING WORK IS EXECUTED.

Dr. Johnson was one of the greatest men that the English nation has ever produced; and when the exhibition of truth depended on his own gigantic powers of intellect, he seldom erred. But in the compilation of his Dictionary, he manifested a great defect of research, by means of which he often fell into mistakes; and no errors are so dangerous as those of great men. The authority created by the general excellence of their works, gives a sanction to their very mistakes, and represses that spirit of inquiry which would investigate the truth, and subvert the errors of inferior men. It seems to be owing to this cause chiefly, that the most obvious mistakes of Johnson's Dictionary have remained to this day uncorrected, and still continue to disfigure the improved editions of the work recently published.

In like manner, the opinions of this author, when wrong, have a weight of authority that renders them extremely mischievous. The sentiment contained in this single line,

Quid te exempla juvat spinis de pluribus una?

is of this kind; that we are to make no corrections, because we cannot complete the reformation; a sentiment that sets itself in direct opposition to all improvement in science, literature, and morals; a sentiment which, if it had been always an efficacious principle of human conduct, would have condemned, not only our language, but our manners and our knowledge, to everlasting rudeness. And hence, whenever a proposition is made to correct the orthography of our language, it is instantly repelled with the opinion and *ipse dixit* of Johnson.

A considerable part of Johnson's Dictionary is, however, well executed; and when his definitions are correct, and his arrangement judicious, it seems to be expedient to follow him. It would be mere affectation or folly to alter what cannot be improved.

The principal faults in Johnson's Dictionary are,

1. The want of a great number of well authorized words belonging to the language. This defect has been, in part, supplied by Mason, but his supplemental list is still imperfect, even in common words, and still more defective from the omission of terms of science.

2. Another great fault that remains uncorrected, is the manner of noting the accented syllable; the accent being laid uniformly on the vowel, whether it closes the syllable or not. Thus the accent is laid on *e* in *té nant* as well as in *té acher*,

and the inquirer cannot know from the accent, whether the vowel is long or short. It is surprising that such a notation should still be retained in that work.

3. It is considered as a material fault, that in some classes of words, Johnson's orthography is either not correct upon principle, or not uniform in the class. Thus he writes *heedlessly*, with *ss*, but *carelessly*, with one *s*; *defence*, with *c*, but *defensible*, *defensive*, with *s*; *rigour*, *inferiour*, with *u*, but *rigorous*, *inferiority*, without it; *publick*, *authentick*, with *k*, but *publication*, *authenticate*, without it; and so of many other words of the same classes.

4. The omission of the participles or most of them, is no small defect, as many of them, by use, have become proper adjectives, and require distinct definitions. The additions of this kind in this work are very numerous. It is also useful both to natives and foreigners, to be able, by opening a dictionary, to know when the final consonant of a verb is doubled in the participle.

5. The want of due discrimination in the definitions of words that are nearly synonymous, or sometimes really synonymous, at other times not, is a fault in all the dictionaries of our language, which we have seen. *Permeate*, says Johnson, signifies *to pass through*; and *Permeable*, *such as may be passed through*. But we *pass through* a door or gate; although we do not *permeate* it, or say that it is *permeable*. *Obedience*, says Johnson, is *obsequiousness*, but this is rarely the present sense of the word; so far from it, that *obedience* is always honourable, and *obsequiousness* usually implies meanness. *Peculation*, says Johnson, is *robbery of the public*, *theft of public money*. But as *robbery* and *theft* are now understood, it is neither. Inaccuracies of this kind are very numerous.

6. The mistakes in etymology are numerous; and the whole scheme of deducing words from their original is extremely imperfect.

7. The manner of defining words in Johnson, as in all other Dictionaries, is susceptible of improvement. In a great part of the more important words, and particularly verbs, lexicographers, either from negligence or want of knowledge, have inverted the true order, or have disregarded all order in the definitions. There is a primary sense of every word, from which all the other have proceeded; and whenever this can be discovered, this sense should stand first in order. Thus the primary sense of *make* is to *force* or *compel*; but this in Johnson's Dictionary is the *fifteenth* definition; and this sense of *facio* in Ainsworth, the *nineteenth*.

8. One of the most objectionable parts of Johnson's Dictionary, in our opinion, is the great number of passages cited from authors, to exemplify his definitions. Most English words are so familiarly and perfectly understood, and the sense of them so little liable to be called in question, that they may be safely left to rest on the authority of the lexicographer, without examples. Who needs extracts from three authors, Knolles, Milton, and Berkeley, to prove or illustrate the literal meaning of *hand*? Who needs extracts from Shakspeare, Bacon, South, and Dryden, to prove *hammer* to be a legitimate English word, and to signify an instrument for driving nails? So under *household*, we find seven passages and nearly thirty lines employed to exemplify the plain interpretation, *a family living together*.

In most cases, one example is sufficient to illustrate the meaning of a word, and this is not absolutely necessary, except in cases where the signification is a deviation from the plain, literal sense, a particular application of the term; or in a case where the sense of the word may be doubtful and of questionable authority. Numerous citations serve to swell the size of a Dictionary, without any adequate advantage. But this is not the only objection to Johnson's exemplifications. Many of the passages are taken from authors now little read, or not at all; whose style is now antiquated, and by no means furnishing proper models for students of the present age.

In the execution of this work, we have pursued a course somewhat different; not, however, without fortifying our own opinion with that of other gentlemen, in whose judgment we have confidence. In many cases, where the sense of a word is plain and indisputable, we have omitted to cite any authority. We have done the same in many instances, where the sense of

a word is wholly obsolete, and the definition useful only to the antiquary. In some instances, definitions are given without authority, merely because we had neglected to note the author, or had lost the reference. In all such cases, however, we have endeavoured to be faithful to the duty of a lexicographer.

In general, we have illustrated the significations of words, and proved them to be legitimate, by a short passage from some respectable author, often abridged from the whole passage cited by Johnson. In many cases, we have given brief sentences of our own; using the phrases or sentences in which the word most frequently occurs, and often presenting some important maxim or sentiment in religion, morality, law, or civil policy. Under words which occur in the Scriptures, we have often cited passages from our common version, not only to illustrate the scriptural or theological sense, but even the ordinary significations of the words. These passages are short, plain, appropriate, and familiar to most readers. In a few cases, where the sense of a word is disputed, we have departed from the general plan, and cited a number of authorities.

In the admission of words of recent origin into a Dictionary, a lexicographer has to encounter many difficulties; as it is not easy, in all cases, to determine whether a word is so far authorized as to be considered legitimate. Some writers indulge a licentiousness in coining words, which good sense would wish to repress. At the same time, it would not be judicious to reject all new terms; as these are often necessary to express new ideas; and the progress of improvement in arts and science would be retarded, by denying a place in Dictionaries to terms given to things newly discovered. But the lexicographer is not answerable for the bad use of the privilege of coining new words. It seems to be his duty to insert and explain all words which are used by respectable writers or speakers, whether the words are destined to be received into general and permanent use or not. The future must depend on public taste, or the utility of the words; circumstances which are not within the lexicographer's control.

Lexicographers are sometimes censured for inserting in their vocabularies vulgar words, and terms of art, known only to particular artisans. That this practice may be carried too far, is admitted; but it is to be remarked that, in general, vulgar words are the oldest and best authorized words in language; and their use is as necessary to the classes of people who use them, as elegant words are to the statesman and the poet. It may be added, that such words are often particularly useful to the lexicographer, in furnishing him with the primary sense, which is no where to be found but in *popular use*.

The catalogue of *obsolete* words in Johnson, has been considerably augmented by Mason. We have inserted nearly the whole catalogue, which, we presume, amounts to seven or eight, and perhaps, to ten thousand words.

In exhibiting the origin and affinities of English words, we have usually placed *first in order* the corresponding word, in the language from or through which we have received it; then the corresponding words in the languages of the same family or race; then the corresponding word in the languages of other families. Thus, for example, the word *break* we have from our Saxon ancestors; we, therefore, give the Saxon word first; then the same word in the German language; then the Celtic words; then the Latin; and, lastly, the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Arabic. This order is not followed in every instance, even of vernacular words, but it is the more general course we have pursued. When there can be no rational doubt respecting the radical identity of words, we have inserted them without any expression of uncertainty. When there appears to be any reason to question that identity, we have mentioned the probability only of an affinity, or inserted a query, to invite further investigation. Yet we are aware that many things, which, in our view, are not doubtful, will appear so to persons not versed in this subject, and who do not at once see the chain of evidence which has led us to our inferences. For this there is no remedy but further investigation.

In regard to words which have been introduced into the language in modern days, we have generally referred them to the language from which they have been immediately received. A great part of these are from the Latin, through the French; sometimes, probably, through the Italian or Spanish. In

INTRODUCTION.

some instances, however, the order is reversed; indeed, it cannot always be known from which language the words have been received, nor is it a matter of any consequence.

One circumstance, however, deserves to be particularly noticed; that when a vernacular word is referred to the corresponding word in one of the Shemitic languages, we would not have it understood that the English word was *derived* or *borrowed* from that Oriental word. For example, we have given the Shemitic פָּרַק as the verb corresponding with the English *break*, that is, the same word in those languages; not intending by this that our ancestors borrowed or received that word from the Chaldeans, Hebrews, or other Shemitic nation. This is not the fact. It would be just as correct for the compiler of a Chaldee or Hebrew Lexicon, to derive פָּרַק from the English *break* or German *brechen*. So when we deduce coin,

through the French, Spanish, or Italian, from the Arabic قَيْن,

we do not consider the word as borrowed from the Arabic, but as proceeding from a common radix. With regard to *vernacular* words, in any European language, such deduction is

always incorrect. Yet errors of this kind abound in every book we have seen, which treats of this subject. The truth is, all *vernacular* words in the languages of Europe are as old as the same words in Asia; and when the same words are found in the Shemitic and Japhetic languages, it is almost demonstrably certain that these words were in use *before the dispersion*; the nations of both families have them from the common stock, and the words, like the families of men which use them, are to be considered as of the same antiquity.

When, therefore, we state the words of another language as corresponding with *vernacular* words in the English, they are offered as affinities, or the same word varied dialectically, perhaps, in orthography or signification, but words from the same root as the English. Thus under the word *bright*, we state the Saxon word, and then the corresponding word in the Ethiopic, the participle of a verb; not that our ancestors borrowed the word from the Ethiopians, but that the verb from which *bright* was derived, though lost in the Saxon, is still retained in the Ethiopic. This fact proves that the ancestors of the Saxons once used the verb, but suffered it to go into disuse, substituting *shine*, *scinan*, in its place.

ENGLISH ALPHABET.

LANGUAGE or speech consists of human voices or articulate sounds, intended to communicate thoughts or ideas from one person to another.

Articulate voices are those which are formed by closing and opening the organs of speech; the lips, the tongue, the teeth, &c. An articulation is a jointing or closing of the organs, as in pronouncing *ab, ed, op, un, at, eth, ag, eng.*

Articulate sounds of the human voice are represented by letters or characters written, painted, engraved, or printed. A letter, or letters in combination, form syllables and words, which are the symbols of ideas.

To letters, syllables, and words, are annexed certain sounds, which, being uttered by the organs of speech, communicate ideas, through the instrumentality of the ears. When letters and words are written, painted, engraved, or printed, they communicate thoughts, through the instrumentality of the eyes.

In order to the communication of thoughts or opinions correctly, from one person to another, it is essential that both persons should annex the same sounds to the same letters and words; or that the letters and words used, should be symbols of the same thoughts, to both persons. This identity of sounds and symbols, constitutes a particular language, the instrument of social intercourse in a nation.

In the English language, the letters are *twenty-six*; representing sounds, simple or compound; or modifying such sounds.

Letters are of two kinds, *vowels* and *consonants*.

Vowels are vocal sounds, uttered by opening the mouth or organs of speech, without a contact of the parts of the mouth. The sound of a perfect vowel may be prolonged at pleasure, without altering the position of the organs. Such is the first or long sound of *a, e, o*.

The vowels in the English are *six*; *a, e, i, o, u, y*. But *i* and *u* are not always simple vowels; and *y* is sometimes used as a consonant. These letters also represent different sounds; a circumstance which creates much difficulty in learning the language.

The broadest or deepest vowel sound is that of *a* in *fall, au* in *ought, aw* in *law*. This sound requires the largest opening of the mouth. A less opening of the organs gives the sound of the Italian *a*, as in *father, ask, last, mast*. A still smaller opening gives the sound of *a* in *fate, make*; and a still smaller, gives the sound of *e* in *mete, feet*. The first sound of *o*, as in *note*, is made by a circular position of the lips; and with a less circular opening of the lips, we utter the sound of *oo* in *tool*.

The first or long sound of *i* is compound, as in *pine*; so is the first sound of *u* in *due, suit, tribunal*. These sounds cannot be exactly expressed or described in writing.

The first or long sound of each vowel is exemplified in the following words:—

<i>a</i> in make, name.	<i>o</i> in note, hold.
<i>e</i> in me, mete.	<i>u</i> in duty, mute.
<i>i</i> in pine, bind.	<i>y</i> in dry, defy.

The short sound of each vowel may be exemplified in the following words:—

<i>a</i> in mat, ban.	<i>o</i> in not, boss.
<i>e</i> in bet, men.	<i>u</i> in dun, must.
<i>i</i> in bit, pin.	<i>y</i> in pity, duty.

The vowel *a* has a third sound, called *broad*, as in *ball, all, walk*. The same sound is expressed by *au* in *tought, and by aw* in *saw*. This sound is shortened in *what, quadrant, quality*.

The vowel *e* has the sound of long *a* in a few words, as in *prey, survey, their*.

The letter *i* retains its French sound, that of the English long *e*, in some words which we have received from the French language; as in *pique, marine, machine*.

The vowel *o*, in a few words, has the sound of *oo*, the French *ou*; as in *more, prove, lose*. This sound of *oo* is shortened in *book, look*. In a few words *o* has the sound of *u* short, as in *dove, love*.

The first sound of *y*, as in *dry*, is the same as that of *i* in *pine*; and its short sound in *glory, pity*, is the same as that of *i* in *pin, brisk*. This short sound of *i* and *y* is, properly, the short sound of *e* long. Hence *little*, when the first vowel is prolonged, becomes *leetle*. Hence *been* is pronounced *bin*.

The short *e* in *let*, is nearly, but not precisely, the short sound of *a* in *late*.

The vowel *u*, in some words, has the sound of *oo* in *book*, as in *pull, full, put*.

The letter *u*, in some words, is pronounced *yu*, in which case it is anomalous, representing both a consonant and a vowel. This pronunciation occurs in words which begin with *u*, forming a syllable by itself; as in *unite, union, unanimous*; and before *r*, as in *failure, measure, insure*, and in a few other cases.

Some English writers allege that the proper sound of *u* is *yu*. This is a great mistake; the true sound is nearly *eu*, but these letters do not express its exact sound.

The letter *w* has its form and its name from the union of two *v*'s, in old books; *v* being called *yu*. This name is ill-chosen, and not adapted to express its sound. This letter is, properly, a vowel, with the sound of *oo*, French *ou*, but shortened in pronunciation, as in *dwell*, pronounced *doowl*.

INTRODUCTION.

Two vowels rapidly pronounced in one syllable, constitute a diphthong; as *oi* in *join*; *oy* in *joy*; *ou* in *sound*; and *ow* in *row*.

Two vowels in succession, when one only is pronounced, do not form a diphthong. We denominate such vowels a *digraph*; that is, *double written*. Such are the following, *ai, ay, au, io, ea, ee, ei, eu, eo, ey, ie, ou, ui*.

Consonants are the letters which represent the articulations of the organs. The letters of this sort, in the English language, are the following, in large and small characters:—*B, b; C, c; D, d; F, f; G, g; H, h; J, j; K, k; L, l; M, m; N, n; P, p; Q, q; R, r; S, s; T, t; V, v; X, x; Z, z*.

The articulations or jointings made by these letters, may be learned from the following syllables:—*ab, ad, af, ag, aj, ak, al, am, an, ap, aq, ar, as, at, av, az*. Observe the point of contact in the organs which stops the sound.

The letters *b, f, p, m, v*, represent the articulations of the lips, and are called *labials*, or *lip-letters*.

The consonants *d, t, l, n*, and *th*, represent the jointings of the tongue and the upper teeth, or gum in which the teeth are inserted. For this reason they are denominated *dentals*, or *tooth-letters*.

The consonants close *c*, close *g*, *k*, and *q*, represent the articulations of the lower part of the tongue and upper part of the mouth, or palate: hence they are called *palatals*, or *palate-letters*.

The consonants *s* and *z*, represent the position of the end of the tongue near the upper teeth; and when pronounced, the breath issues or is driven out between the tongue and teeth, with a hissing; hence these letters are called *sibilants*, or *hissing-letters*. The letter *c* before *e, i*, and *y*, is precisely equivalent to *s*.

The letter *r* is uttered with a jar or vibration of the end of the tongue, near the upper teeth.

The letters *j* and *x* represent each two sounds; those of *j* may be expressed by *dj*, and those of *x* by *ks*. The consonant *g* before *e, i*, and *y*, is, in many words, the exact equivalent of *j*.

The close articulations interrupt all distinct sound; such are *k, p*, and *t*, as in *ak, ap, at*. These are called *mutes*. *B* and *d* are mutes, but less close.

C and *g* are close articulations at the end of syllables, as in *public, rag*. At the beginning of syllables, they are close before *a, o*, and *u*, as in *can, cot, cud; gap, go, gun*. But before *e, i*, and *y*, *c* is equivalent to *s*, as in *cedar, city, cycle*; and *g* is sometimes close, as in *gift*, and sometimes compound, as in *general, ginger*.

The consonants which represent articulations not close, are *f, l, m, n, r, s, v, z*; as in the syllables, *ef, el, em, en, er, es, ev, ez*.

H represents a breathing, and is denominated *aspirate*.

There are in English, four articulations, for which there are no single characters; but they are represented by *ch, sh, th*, and *ng*.

The sound of *ch*, as in *church, cheer*, may be represented by *tsh*.

The sound of *sh* occurs in *shine, shall*. It is precisely equivalent to the French *ch*.

Th are aspirated in *think, throne*; but vocal in *that, thou*.

The sound of *ng* is simple, and occurs in *sing, thing*, in which the articulation is not close. But in *finger, linger, longer*, the articulation is more close. Orthoepists have represented the pronunciation of the latter words as doubling the articulation; thus, *fin-ger*. But this is a mistake; there is but one articulation; nor is it possible to pronounce two consonants between two vowels, without two articulations; two closings and openings of the organs. *Ban'er* and *ban'ner* are pronounced alike, with one articulation. Thus consonants may be doubled in writing, but they are not doubled in pronunciation.

Orthoepists represent, that in the combination *nk*, as in *ink, bank*, *n* has the sound of *ng*. This is a mistake. The sound of *ng* is nasal, the articulation being less close than *nk*. If the *n* in such words had the sound of *ng*, then *ink* would have a nasal sound, *ing*, preceding *k*; but this is not the fact; on the other hand, the close articulation *k*, stops all sound. Walker, then, in representing *bank, brink*, as being pronounced *bangk, bringk*, entirely mistakes the fact.

RULES FOR PRONUNCIATION,

AND EXPLANATIONS OF THE MANNER OF DESIGNATING SOUNDS IN THIS WORK.

THE first or long sound of the vowels is designated by a horizontal mark over the vowel, thus *a, ē, i, ō, ū, y*. But the necessity of this mark is superseded in words and syllables ending in *e*, after a single consonant, as in *fate, mete, rite, note, mute*, in which the first vowel is long, and the final *e* is silent. So also in the last syllables of *colonnade, fortitude, antipode, suicide, proselyte, consecrate*, and others of similar formation.

The first sound of a vowel is also indicated by the mark of accent immediately after the vowel, as in *fa'vor, ce'dar, vi'tal, gl'o'ry, tru'ty, cy'cle*.

The second or short sound of a single vowel is indicated by one or more consonants terminating the word or syllable, as in *ban, band, pen, bend, pin, flint, not, plot, sun, must, cyst, withstand, descend, rotund*.

The short sound is also indicated by the mark of accent immediately after a single consonant, as in *sal'ary, en'ergy, inf'amy, bot'any, hus'band, sym'bol*.

The third or broad sound of *a* is designated by two points under the vowel; thus, *baïl, broäd*. But the necessity of these points is superseded by a general rule, that in most words in which *a* is followed by *ld, lk, ll*, as in *bald, balk, 'all*; the letter *a* has its broad sound.

This broad sound occurs in the digraphs *au* and *aw*; as in *taught, law*.

When this broad *a* is shortened, the sound is indicated by a single point under *a*; as in *what, quadrant*.

The fourth or Italian sound of *a* is designated by two points over the letter; thus, *bär, mäst, fäther*.

The letter *e*, having the sound of *a* long, has a mark under the letter; as in *prey, convey*.

The letter *i*, when it has the sound of *e* long, has two points over the letter; thus, *fatigue, marine*.

The letters *i* and *o*, when they have the sound of *u* short, have a curving mark; thus, *bïrd, döve*.

The vowel *o* has, in a few words, the sound of *oo*, French *ou*, which is indicated by two dots over the letter; thus, *möve, löse*. This sound, when shortened, is designated by two points under the vowel; thus, *boök, loök*; *bush, full*.

The two letters *oo*, without points, have the sound of the French *ou*; as in *fool, room*.

The digraphs *ai, ay*, always have the sound of the first or long *a*, unless otherwise marked.

The digraphs *ea, ee, ei, ie*, always have the sound of the first or long *e*, unless otherwise marked.

In all cases, when one vowel of a digraph is marked, that vowel has the sound designated by the mark, and the other is quiescent; thus, *upbriät, arräyed, brëed, decëit, siëge, appëur, cöurse, floät, broäp, veïn, shöw*.

By marking the vowel *o*, in the digraphs *ou* and *ow*, the digraph is distinguished from the diphthong; thus, in *söurce, ou* are a digraph; but in *sour* they are a diphthong; and *böwe*, a weapon, is distinguished from *bow*, to bend.

Thus *ou* and *ow*, without a mark, are always diphthongs.

The digraphs *eu, ew*, and *ui*, have the sound of the first *u*; as in *feud, brew, bruise*. The writers who attempt to give *u* as *ew* after *r*, the sound of *oo*, as in *rude, brew, [rood, broo]*, encourage an affected pronunciation. In all such words, *u* and

INTRODUCTION.

ew have the proper sound of *u* in *duty*, *tumult*, *lucid*, according to the general usage in England. Some persons affect to pronounce the letters *e* and *w* distinctly *e* and *oo*; but this affectation was condemned by Wallis, as early as the reign of Charles II.

The vowel *i*, in the termination *ie*, is always short; as in *motine*, *relative*, pronounced *motin*, *relativ*.

The peculiar articulation of the letter *r*, renders it necessary to utter a slight sound of *e* short, between a vowel and that letter. Thus, *bare*, *mere*, *mere*, *mire*, *mure*, *mure*, are pronounced *baer*, *meer*, *mier*, *moer*, *muer*; so in *parent*, *apparent*, pronounced nearly *paerent*, *appaerent*. This necessity makes a slight variation in the sound of *a*, but too inconsiderable to deserve a particular mark of distinction.

The accented syllable is designated by this mark ' at the end; as in *la'bour*, *gl'o'ry*, *ten'or*, *amend'*, *del'riment*, *with-draw'*, *avow'd*, *destroy'*, *renew'd*.

After syllables having two or more consonants followed by *e* quiescent, or a diphthong, the accent has no effect upon the vowel; as in *dislodge'*, *rejoice'*.

In many cases, the mark over the vowel designates both the sound of the vowel and the accented syllable; as in *abradé*, *upbráid*, *deduce*, *besiége*.*

The letters *ch*, in words from the French, are pronounced as *sh*, and over the letter *c* is a mark; thus *chaise*, pronounced *sháyze*.

When either of the consonants *c*, *s*, or *t*, is preceded by the accent, either primary or secondary, and followed by a diphthong or *u* long, it becomes aspirated, and is pronounced as if written *sh*, *tsh*, or *zh*. Thus *nation*, *social*, *satiate*, *especial*, *disclosure*, *allusion*, &c., are pronounced *na'shun*, *so'shal*, *sa'sheate*, *espe'shal*, *discl'os'zhure*, *allu'zhun*, &c. When, however, the accent falls upon the vowel or diphthong following *c*, *s*, or *t*, the preceding consonant is not aspirated, as in the words *soci'ety*, *sati'ety*. The above rule is of very great importance, and obtains throughout the whole language, and even extends to all proper names, whether Latin, Greek, or Hebrew. The want of attention to it has led orthoepists into numerous errors.

When two accents occur after *e* or *i*, and before *ci* and *ti*, they indicate that the preceding syllable ends with the pronunciation of *sh*. Thus, *pre'ci'ous*, *vi'ti'ate*, are pronounced *pres'h'ous*, *vish'ate*; the *ci* and *ti* blending into the sound of *sh*, in accordance with the rule above laid down.

In such words as *pronunciation*, euphony seems to require that *cia* should be uttered in two syllables, *pro-nun-ci-a'-tion*, to prevent the repetition of the sound of *sh*; *pronunshashun*.

Dr. Ash remarks, that the different vowels, in unaccented syllables, are pronounced alike or nearly so. Thus, in the words *altar*, *alter*, *manner*, *manor*, *murmur*, all the vowels of the last syllables have the same sound. Hence it is useless to mark the unaccented vowels; their sounds being too obscure and indistinct to be defined, or to be distinguished by marks. The nice distinctions between them, if any exist, are to be acquired only by usage and good taste.

The letters *gh*, in most English words, are quiescent. In the following, they are pronounced like *f*; *cough*, *chough*, *clough*, *enough*, *hough*, *laugh*, *rough*, *slough*, *tough*, *trough*.

H after *r*, is mute; as in *rhetoric*.

G and *k* before *n*, are mute; as in *gnaw*, *knave*.

W before *r*, is mute; as in *wrest*, *wrong*.

In a few words, *h* after *w*, is pronounced before it; as in *what*, *which*.

In the termination *en*, *e* is usually mute; as in *broken*, pronounced *brokn*.

The final *e* is mute after *l*, in the following syllables; *ble*, *cle*, *dle*, *fle*, *gle*, *kle*, *ple*, *tle*, *zle*.

B after *m*, is mute; as in *dumb*.

L is mute before *k*; as in *walk*; before *m*; as in *calm*; and before *f*; as in *half*, *calf*.

N is mute after *m*; as in *hymn*.

Ph are always pronounced like *f*; as in *philosophy*; but they are silent in *phthisic*, pronounced *fizzic*.

P is mute before *s*; as in *psalm*; and before *t*; as in *ptyalism*, *Ptolemy*.

In the terminating syllable of adjectives, *ous*, the letter *o* is always silent.

The unaccented *y*, at the end of words, is short, like *i* in *pin*, *pit*; as in *glory*, *probability*. In the plural of such words, *ies* are pronounced *iz*; as *glories*, pronounced *gloriz*.

But *y*, in monosyllables, has its first sound, as in *dry*, *my*; and in verbs the same sound occurs in the inflections; as in *fly*, *flios*; *try*, *tries*; pronounced *ftize*, *trize*.

In the termination *fy*, the *y* has its first sound; as in *fortify*. So also *i* in the last syllable of *fortifies*.

S has its proper sound after *f*, *p*, *k*, *t*, and *th* aspirate; as in *chiefs*, *caps*, *franks*, *pits*, *deaths*.

S has the sound of *z* after *b*, *d*, *g*, *gh*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *s* and *ss*, *z*, *v*, *aw*, *ay*, *ev*, *ey*, *ow*, *oy*, *sh*, *ng*, *th* vocal *ch*, *oe*, *ie*, and after *c* followed by *e* final; as in *robs*, *robes*, *races*, *rods*, *rides*, *rags*, *rages*, *toils*, *dreams*, *sighs*, *rains*, *bars*, *waves*, *roses*, *passes*, *mazes*, *laws*, *days*, *news*, *preys*, *voies*, *joys*, *brushes*, *sings*, *breathes*, *churches*, *foes*, *flies*.

Before *m* has the sound of *z*; as in *spasm*, *baptism*.

The letter *z*, in Welsh words, is pronounced as the vocal *th*, in *that*, *thou*.

In many cases, a word, the better to express the pronunciation, is written a second time, in the letters most proper for the purpose. In this case, the pronunciation of the radical word is to be observed in the derivatives, unless otherwise noted. Thus, *bright* is written *brite*, to show the pronunciation; and this pronunciation is to be observed in its derivatives, *brightness*, *brightly*.

POINTED LETTERS.

Ā, *ā*, as in *fate*.

ʌ, *a*, broad, as in *fall*.

ʌ, *a*, as in *what*.

Ā, *ā*, Italian, as in *father*.

Ē, *ē*, as in *mete*, *meet*.

E, *e*, first *a*, as in *prey*.

I, *i*, long, as in *pine*.

Y, *i*, *e* long, as in *fatigue*.

I, *i*, short *u*, as in *bird*.

Ō, *ō*, short *u*, as in *dove*.

Ō, *ō*, long, as in *note*.

Ū, *ū*, like *oo*, as in *move*.

ŪŪ, *ūū*, like *oo*, in *good*.

Ū, long, as in *tune*.

Ū, as in *pull*.

Ū, initial, as in *unite*.

€, as *h*.

€, as *j*.

€H, as *sh*.

€H, as *h*.

TH, vocal, as in *that*.

The letter *u*, it has been remarked, has the sound of *yu* in words in which this letter forms a syllable by itself; as in *u-nit*, *u-nanimous*, *u-biquity*, *u-surp*, and in some monosyllables; as in *use*, pronounced *yuse*.

An attempt to extend this sound to *u* after *d*, as in *gradual*, *credulous*, has resulted in changing the sound of *d* to that of *tj*; and *gradual* becomes *gradjual* or *grajual*; *credulous* is changed to *credjulous*, or *crejulous*. But this pronunciation of Walker is severely condemned by Jamieson and Knowles. So also Walker's *butsheus* for *beauteous*; *plentshus* for *plenteous*, are condemned and discarded. The same fate attends Walker's *ingrejent* for *ingredient*, and other words of a like orthography.

The present practice is to give to *u* the sound of *yu*, in such words as *nature*, *feature*, *rapture*; which are pronounced *nat-yur*, *feat-yur*, *rapt-yur*. This practice seems to have been adopted to avoid the common corruption of a change of *t* into *tsh*, as in *natshur*, a pronunciation condemned by the latest orthoepists.

But in words of more syllables than two, this pronunciation of *u* as *yu*, in the last syllable, as in *caricature*, *literature*, *judicature*, is not to be commended.

The termination *ed*, in the past tense, and participles of verbs, retains the vowel *e*, in this vocabulary, for showing the proper orthography, especially to foreigners; but in the customary pronunciation, this vowel is omitted, except after *a* and *t*. Thus *abandoned*, *delivered*, *charmed*, are pronounced *abandon'd*, *deliver'd*, *charm'd*. This rule extends to all cases, except to some formal uses of particular words, or to occasional uses of some words in verse.

After *d* and *t* this termination *ed* is, from necessity, pronounced as a distinct syllable; as in *abraded*, *hated*.

* It is said by some writer, that the accent never falls on a vowel, but always on a consonant. This is a great mistake. The last syllable of *forcee* has the accent on the last syllable, and on the vowels which end the syllable. In *open*, the accent is on the first syllable in which there is no consonant.

